NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXXXVIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1901.

SHAKESPEARE.

THE TRICENTENNIAL OF HIS BIRTH, APRIL, 1864.

BY VICTOR HUGO.

DEATH always brings justice at the last. Very recently an opportunity has offered of pronouncing a final verdict upon Shakespeare, and of discharging the debts of the past; the 23rd of April, the date of the birth of the illustrious poet of Stratford has returned for the three hundredth time.

After three centuries mankind has something to say to one who has long been insulted. It has seemed as if Shakespeare were standing upon the soil of France; Paris has risen; the poets, the artists, the historians, have stretched out their hands to this phantom by whose side the poets have seen Hamlet, the artists Prospero, and the historians Julius Cæsar. The drunken savage, the barbarous harlequin, the mountebank Shakespeare has appeared, and only the light which surrounds him has been visible; the ridicule of two centuries has ended in dazzling radiance, and France has cried: "Welcome genius." Glory has assumed a definite shape.

We have been conscious of a movement in the shades where congregate our august dead. We have thought that Molière smiled; that Corneille bent his head. No old hatreds, old in-

Copyright, 1901, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

justices, nor a murmur, but unanimous enthusiasm, and at this time those who appreciate profundity, those whose hatred of despots is only equalled by their love of intellect, those who wishing that justice be done wish also that it may be rendered, the thoughtful solitaries occupied with the ideal, the dreamers have wondered and been stirred at the tranquillity attending this majestic entrance.

Shakespeare the drunken savage! Savage, yes, but the inhabitant of the virgin forest; drunken indeed, but with the ideal. He is a giant, beneath the boughs of enormous trees, who holds a great golden cup, and the light which he drinks is reflected in his eyes. Shakespeare, like Æschylus, like Job, like Isaiah, is one of the sovereigns of thought and of poesy, who, sufficient for the All Mysterious, have the depth of creation itself, and who like creation itself translate and illustrate this depth by a profusion of forms and images, springing from the darkness, in flowers, in leaves and in living streams.

Shakespeare, like Æschylus, is prodigal with the unfathomable. The unfathomable is the inexhaustible. The more profound the thought, the more vital the expression. Out of blackness comes color. The life of the abyss is hidden; the central fire produces the volcano, the volcano the lava, the lava oxides. The oxides seek, meet and fertilize the root; the root creates the flower. Thus the rose springs from the flames. The labor of the abyss is repeated in the brain of the genius. The idea, the abstraction within the poet is charm and reality in the poem. What darkness beneath the earth, what tingling life on its surface! Without the darkness there would be no life. The vegetation of imagery and expression is rooted in mystery. The flowers are the proof of the depths.

Shakespeare, like all the poets of this order, has absolute personality. He has a method peculiar to himself of imagination, of creation, of production. Imagination, creation and production are three concentric phenomena united in genius. Genius is the sphere of their radiation. Imagination invents, creation organizes, production realizes. Production is the entrance of matter into the idea, giving it a body, rendering it palpable and visible, endowing it with form, with sound, with color, giving it a mouth to speak, feet to walk, and wings to fly; in a word, making the idea exterior to the poet, at the same time that it remains

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interior to him and bound to him by idiosyncrasy, the umbilical cord which reunites the creation to the creator.

With all the great poets the phenomenon of inspiration is the same, but the diversity of their minds varies it indefinitely.

The idea arises in the brain: conception; the idea develops into a type: gestation; the type becomes man: infancy; the man translates himself into action and passion: work.

The idea in the type, the type in the man, the man in the action, so it is with Shakespeare, as with Æschylus, with Plautus, with Cervantes, the phenomenon which repeats itself in the concrete life in the drama.

In the masterpiece everything is done with intention. Shakespeare informs this subject, that and not another, its development, its personages, its passions, its philosophy, its action, its style. He creates it resembling humanity—and himself. In full face it is man, in profile Shakespeare. Change the name to Aristophanes, Molière, Beaumarchais, the formula is still true.

These men have originality, the great gift of an individual starting point. Hence their power.

Virgil starts from Homer. Observe the growing degeneration of the imitation. Racine starts from Virgil, Voltaire from Racine, Chénier (Marie Joseph) from Voltaire, Luce de Lancival from Chénier, Zéro from Luce de Lancival. Gradually we arrive at obliteration. The decreasing progression is the most dangerous form of motion. Whoever engages in it is lost. No rolling mill produces such an effacement.

For example, study Hector at his starting point in Homer and see him at his ending in Luce de Lancival.

In France the decreasing progression has been called the classic school. Its product is a literature of pale colors, of faded tints. Toward 1804 poetry began to decline.

At the beginning of this century, under the empire which ended at Waterloo, this literature had said its last word. At this period it had reached its perfection. Our fathers saw its apogee, that is to say, its agony.

Original minds, poets of the first order, are not subject to this chlorosis. The sickly pallor of imitation is unknown to them. The poetry of others is not in their veins. Their blood is their own. To produce is a condition of life. They create because they exist. They breathe, and behold a masterpiece.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The identification of their style with themselves is complete. For the true critic, who is a chemist, the least detail is a condensation of their total. This word is Æschylus, this word is Juvenal, this Dante. *Unsex*—all Lady Macbeth is in that word, peculiar to Shakespeare. Not an idea in the poet, as not a leaf on the tree, which is not rooted in himself. We do not see its origin; that is below the earth, but there it is. The idea leaves the brain expressed, that is to say united with the words, capable of analysis and yet concrete, compounded of the age and of the poet, apparently simple yet really composite. Springing thus from the depths, each idea of the poet one with the words sums up in its microcosm all the elements which make the poet. One taste suffices for the whole. Whence it comes that each detail of style, each term, each word, each meaning, each extension, each construction, each turn of speech is metaphysical.

We have said elsewhere that the word is the flesh of the idea, but this flesh is living. If, like the old school of criticism which separated the matter from the form, you separate the idea from the word, you kill. As in death, the idea—that is, the soul—disappears. Your war on the word is an attack on the idea. An indivisible style is the characteristic of the writer of the highest order. The historian like Tacitus, the poet like Shakespeare puts his organization, his passion, his acquirement, his suffering, his illusions, his destiny, his whole being into each line of his book, into each sigh of his poem, into each cry of his drama.

The imperious dictates of the conscience, and a certain one knows not what of the peremptory which resembles obligation, manifest themselves in the style. To write is to do; the writer acts. The expressed idea is an accepted responsibility. For this reason the writer is on intimate terms with his style. He leaves nothing to chance. Responsibility involves solidarity.

The detail adjusts itself to the whole, and is itself a whole. Everything is comprehensive. One word is a tear, one word a flower, another a flash of lightning, another word filth. And the tear burns, the flower dreams, the lightning laughs, the filth shines. Muck and sublimity pair. One poem proves it: Job.

Masterpieces are mysterious formations. Here and there the infinite is hidden. In the midst of all these human emotions, of all this palpitating reality, this pathetic life, the expression which astounds you is an abrupt expansion of the unknown. There is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a certain pre-existence in style. It is always true to its type. It springs from every part of the writer, from the hairs of his head as well as from the depths of his intellect. All of genius, its terrestrial as well as its cosmic side, its humanity, its divinity, the poet as the prophet, is in the style. The style is soul and blood.

It is incontestably fixed, and yet nothing is more free. There is the wonder. No one clogs it, no one inconveniences it, no one limits it. It is impossible not to smile when one hears, for example, of the difficulties of rhyme. Why not also of the hindrances of syntax. These pretended difficulties are the necessary forms of language, whether in prose or verse, engendering themselves, and without preliminary combination. They have their analogy in external facts; the echo is the rhyme of nature.

We knew a poet, Richelet, who as a child composed verses, at first unformed, then less and less incorrect, then at last exact, who discovered for himself, step by step, one after the other, all the laws, the cesura, the alternating feminine rhyme, etc., and to whom prosody came instinctively.

Idiosyncrasy, the umbilical cord of which I have spoken, is a chain which connects the writer and his style. With this attachment, which is the source of its life, it travels over the alembics of grammar. Its principle, which is the writer himself, is incorporated in it, and does not lose an atom by all the processes of selection by which it chooses phrases for prose or verses for poetry.

Within the general limits of rhythm, which he accepts, the poet has his own rhythm. From this arises the surprising elasticity of style which can embrace everything from a subtle chastity to a sublime obscenity, from Petrarch to Rabelais.

Sometimes Petrarch and Rabelais are united in the same man, the gamut of style ranging from Romeo to Falstaff. In the interval the universe is peopled with men, with angels, with fairies; the grave appears with its maker at one extremity, its inhabitant at the other, the grave digger and the ghost; the cynic night shows other than its face—*the buttock of the night;* the sorceress and the rabble of the furies appear, a caricature sketched on the vague background of a dream with the charcoal of hell, and bent over this world created by himself the great poet gazes, listens, embellishes, sneers, loves and dreams.

VICTOR HUGO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN ENGLAND.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L.

THE notable fact in British politics is a weakness of the Opposition in Parliament, such as there has not been since the Tory party came back a wreck from the election which followed the passing of the first Reform Bill. The party system can work well, or, indeed, work at all, only when there is an Opposition strong enough to check the action of the party in power, to keep the Government up to the mark, and to be ready when called upon to take its turn in office. Even Tories, therefore, deplore, or affect to deplore, on constitutional grounds, the want of an effective Opposition. The sorrow of the Government Whip may well be sincere; for his task in bringing members to divisions is made doubly hard. A Government with an overwhelming majority has in fact been more than once brought to the verge of defeat by the apathy and indolence of its supporters, who, though warned by the Whip of a coming division, think they may safely go to their dinner.

So low has sunk the party which twenty years ago came back with a decisive majority from the polls! Nor is the reduction of its numbers in the House of Commons by any means the full measure of its fall and weakness. In the shrunken array on its benches there are eighty Irish Nationalists who abjure the British alliance and, as Home Rulers, are bent on an object which most of the British Liberals at heart abhor and strive to keep practically out of sight, though they dare not strike it out of the platform. The British members of Opposition, again, are divided, intensely and bitterly divided, among themselves on the question of the South African war; and not only on the question of that particular war, but in regard to the whole Imperialist policy, of which the attack on the South African Commonwealths forms

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a part. That section of the Opposition of which Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is the head, and which includes Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Morley, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Labouchere and Mr Channing, is really divided by a wider gulf from Mr. Asquith's section than is Mr. Asquith's section from the Liberal-Unionists on the Government side. Lord Rosebery is perfectly right in saying that the difference of opinion between the sections is fundamental and extends not only to the present war, but to the whole policy of the future, though what his object can be in rubbing salt into the gaping wound is, like his general aim, a mystery.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the official leader of the Opposition, is a parliamentarian of singular tact, as well as a very popular and much respected man. He has done probably all that could be done to harmonize incompatibilities, to present the semblance of a united front, and to prevent his followers from actually filing into hostile lobbies, if he could not prevent their abstention. But his measure of success has been small, and he has had to endure the annoyance of a perpetual revolt inside the party as well as the mockery of the triumphant foe. The Asquith dinner was evidently pointed against him and the section of the party which is loyal to him, though he contrived by adroit management in some measure to deprive the demonstration of its sting.

The Liberal party as a whole is, of course, at present suffering greatly from the influence of the war fever. The situation, in fact, is a signal and almost appalling proof of the temporary autocracy which a Government may obtain by plunging the nation into a war. But in the late election, fought on the war issue, the loss of the Liberal party in seats was only two, though there was a larger reduction of its popular vote. Before the outbreak of the war the Tories had been completely victorious at the polls; and though they no doubt owed their triumph in it largely to the strenuous support of the beer interest, beer may be regarded as their constant ally. Mr. Gladstone, by his conversion to Home Rule, had shattered the party and sent the Unionist section of it over to the Tory side, where, after a provisional domiciliation, it has finally found a home. It must be borne in mind that he appealed to the spirit of separatism, not in Ireland only, but in Scotland and Wales; that he in fact threatened the United Kingdom with disruption. In the fury of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fray he was even led to set the "masses" against the "classes," and ignorance against education. While we give him the utmost credit for ardent enthusiasm in the cause which he had suddenly embraced, it must be allowed that no political leader ever took a surer way to the ruin of his party.

It must be admitted at the same time that there was a general reaction and that the Liberal movement had been losing its force. The extension of the franchise had fully reached what the veteran Liberals of the Reform Club thought its utmost bounds. The only great step remaining to be taken in that direction was woman's suffrage, a plunge from which even decided Radicals recoiled. A period of political lassitude and apathy naturally ensued. The place of political progress in the public mind has for the time been taken by other objects; by pleasures and sports, by royal and military shows, above all by the pursuit of wealth, which is now absorbing and almost wild.

Liberalism had a citadel in the Free Churches, strongholds of conscientious principle, as well as naturally opposed to the privileges of the State Church, which the Tory party upheld. But the Free Churches have been mollified by religious concession, and at the same time specially weakened by the inroads of scepticism, which are more fatal to a church resting solely on conviction than to one which rests on the support of the State, on public endowments, popular habit, and the preference of the wealthy classes for hierarchical government and ancient ritual.

Moreover, the vision of Disraeli and his Tory-Democratic school has been to a not inconsiderable extent fulfilled. The extension of the suffrage to the lowest class has proved favorable, not to progress but rather to reaction. The populace, of the great cities especially, has combined at the polls with the wealthy class against the middle class and the higher order of artisans; much as the populace at Naples sided with the Bourbons against the Liberals there. The metropolitan district, which, half a century ago, was overwhelmingly Liberal, is now not less overwhelmingly Tory. The "Mafeking night," with its immense carnival of riot and debauch, bespoke the political tendencies of a populace which is said to supply eighty thousand customers, men, women and children, every night to the gin palaces and saloons. An attempt made by Lowe, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, some years ago, to tax the city populace by laying a duty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on matches encountered a storm of resistance to which the Government succumbed. But so long as it is not taxed, the populace of London and other great cities is likely to remain Tory, and above all to adhere to a Tory Government, which adds to its ordinary stimulants the excitement of a war. The peasantry shows itself in the elections less Tory than the populace of the cities.

In the world at large a spirit of violence, adverse to political and social progress as well as to international morality, has suddenly prevailed. There seems to be a sort of general satiety of civilization and fancy for a return to the robustness of the barbarian. The doctrine that Might makes Right appears with little or no disguise. Exhibitions of force of all kinds are in fashion. Prize-fighting is revived, bull-fighting is introduced. The roughest sports, such as football, are in vogue. Churches pander to the prevailing tendency and discard, some of their ministers even flout, the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. War is upheld by clergymen, not as an occasional and unwelcome necessity, but as a normal source of good. One cause of this probably is the subversion, by the advance of science, of religion and the religious ideal; while belief in a Providence upholding justice and humanity is beginning to give way to belief in a blind and ruthless force as the ruling power of the universe. But, whatever may be the explanation, this tidal wave of Jingoism could not fail to swamp for the time Liberalism and the Liberal party.

So far as the thoughts of the people are turned to anything political or serious, their present object is not domestic improvement, but extension abroad, and the building up by conquest and Imperial federation of what is called the Greater Britain; a term which, with the opprobrious name Little Englander, applied to the opposite party, suggests that England is not in herself great, but great only in virtue of her connection with a number of scattered dependencies and three hundred millions of subjugated Hindoos. Not that the impelling force of Imperialism is so much desire of territorial extension, as the appetite of the capitalist, who craves for new fields of exploitation, especially for such as can be worked with servile labor. That mere extension of territory is not strength, but more often weakness, is a lesson which has now been generally learned. The tendency,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both in itself and by its conjunction with militarism, is not only alien, but distinctly opposed to the pursuit of internal improvement. Imperialism and Liberalism cannot dwell together under the same roof.

Wealth is always conservative, and its prevalence in elections to Parliament has increased. Of bribery at elections, which in former days prevailed to an enormous extent, there is now little or none. It has been generally extinguished by the strictness of the Election law and the integrity of the judges. But bribery between elections by expenditure of money in donations, subscriptions, Christmas gifts and entertainments, has greatly increased. A member the other day resigned his seat on account of his inability to meet the demand. A wealthy man has been known practically to rent a seat by distributing through his agent every Christmas a large sum in gifts to the poorer electors. No question was ever asked nor was anything ever said by the agent about votes, but it was well understood that the gift would continue so long as his principal remained member for the city.

It was easier in former days to find a seat for a rising Liberal. While the counties were held by Tory squires commercial cities were more open, and the magnates of local commerce were then content with disposing of the representation. They now aspire to the seat for themselves. At a party caucus in view of an election a particular seat was proposed for the consideration of the meeting. The meeting was thereupon told that consideration was useless, as the seat was pre-engaged. The chairman asked for whom. "For So-and-So." "Why, I thought he did not care about politics." "No more he does." "Then, why does he want the seat?" "He does not want it." "Then, why does he take it?" "His wife does." A seat in the House of Commons, unlike a seat in the House of Representatives, still carries with it a certain social grade; it is a key to high circles, and a possible avenue to title. So long as this is the case it will be an object of aspiration to new-made wealth.

The extraordinary worship of the late Queen and of her memory, the Jubilee and the Funeral, have not failed to produce their intended effect, as, in its day, did the Jubilee of George the Third. There has been a sensible revival of that personal authority of the Crown which had been in abeyance or nearly so since George the Third's day. It is difficult to say how far

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this may go or how long it may last. Half a century ago nobody would have believed in the possibility of a monarchical reaction. The question rather was how long even the forms of monarchy would last. To whatever the renewed influence may amount, its exercise can hardly fail to be anti-Liberal. Unless the wearer of the Crown develops personal force and ambition, the influence will probably be wielded in his name by a Tory junto.

Not only has the House of Commons become less Liberal, but its authority as the popular branch of the legislature seems to have declined, while the power of the executive has increased at its expense. It is treated in somewhat cavalier style by the Government. The time and scope for the action of independent members have been curtailed. The gag of the clôture is freely applied. Appropriations to the extent of sixty-seven millions sterling have been carried under clôture in one night.

The influence of the Colonies on British politics again, since they have been brought into closer relations with the mother country, has been and is likely to be Tory. The people of a colony in general know nothing and care nothing about British politics or the objects of a British Liberal party. The connection of the ordinary colonist is solely with the Crown, and however Liberal he may be in his own concerns, in his Imperial relation "loyalty" is the only political sentiment which he knows. In the Colony itself there is nothing to which personal sentiment can attach. The Colonial politician craves for Imperial titles, which are pretty lavishly bestowed on him, and act powerfully on his conduct in all questions concerning the Empire. Some years ago a Canadian politician, then a prominent Liberal, brought forward in the Canadian Parliament a motion pointed against the practice of bestowing Imperial titles on Canadians as inconsistent with the democratic spirit. He backed his motion with a strong speech; but the same man afterwards accepted a Knighthood. This is a point for the serious consideration of British Liberals when they deal with the Colonial question. However democratic a colony may be in itself, its influence on British politics is sure to be Tory.

To the influence exercised on British politics by Colonial worship of Royalty and love of titles has been recently added the strong development of a similar propensity on the part of many wealthy Americans. American millionaires in increasing num-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bers are wholly or partly leaving their own country for one in which, if they cannot get better dinners or more luxury, they can get more subserviency, look for admission to titled society, and perhaps, if they ultimately become naturalized, hope to be wearers of titles themselves. Their political tendencies go along with their social aspirations. Nor is it only by Americans residing in England that the influence on English sentiment is exercised. In this South African war the drawing-rooms of London have received a sensible support from the drawing-rooms of New York.

Before these pages meet the reader's eye the South African war will probably have reached its inevitable end, and the curtain of history will fall on one of the most memorable of all fights for independence. The passions which the war has called into play may take some time in subsiding, but in time they must subside. It is possible that the Liberal party may then reunite and find some question on which it may once more appeal successfully to the people.

If conscription, of which there have been significant hints on the part of the Government, should be proposed, the Liberals will probably take issue thereupon; though some of them—Sir Charles Dilke, for example—are strongly militarist and might bolt upon this question. The character and tendencies of the English people must be greatly changed if a proposal to introduce conscription can succeed. Naval conscription long prevailed in the rude and detestable form of the press-gang. But it died a death of infamy about seventy years ago. Tramps were pressed for the army, it is believed, as late as the American war. Balloting for the militia formerly prevailed, but was suspended by act of Parliament. Conscription for service in India and the other distant provinces of the Empire would be a different thing from German or Italian conscription for home service. If a precedent for it were sought in French conscription for Algeria, the precedent on inquiry would probably be found to condemn the policy; accounts of French barrack life in Algeria, at least, are far from happy. The main defense of the nation is not the army, but the navy, and conscription applied to the navy might have fatal effects on the manning of the mercantile marine. It is not likely, however, that the Tories will offer their opponents battle on this field.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A more likely field of the party battle is afforded by national education, which the clergy, backed by the Tories, are striving to keep in their own hands, while the Liberals seek to secularize it and transfer it from the Church to the Board of Schools. Wind is put into the Liberal sail in this encounter by the panic on the subject of commercial supremacy, which it is supposed that England is losing through defect of popular education; though the fact seems to be simply that the start which she had at the close of the war with Napoleon, when she was left in almost sole possession of manufactures and a mercantile marine, is now, in the natural course of things, being overhauled by other nations, and that if she wishes to hold her own she must eschew Jingoism and devote herself to industry and trade.

The question, however, on which the Liberal party is most likely again to form a front and advance is that of the disestablishment of the State Church. It has already moved in this direction by proposing, under the leadership of Gladstone, to disestablish the Church in Wales. The Church in Wales is not, like the established Church of Ireland, detached from the English Establishment; it is an integral part of the English Establishment though locally in a minority, as the Church of England must be in some districts of England itself. Gladstone, in fact, as he remained to the last a High Anglican, seems to have felt some compunction in fulfilling the promise which, amidst the heat of a great political contest, he had made to disestablish the Church in Wales. The separation of the Church from the State is thoroughly in the spirit of the age, and is bound to come sooner or later in all educated countries, if, indeed, in educated countries the Churches shall continue to exist. In England there are just now influences at work in opposite quarters which would facilitate the attempt. On one hand the ingrained Protestantism of the country is alarmed and exasperated by the efforts of the Ritualist Clergy to revive the religion of the Middle Ages and reimpose the sacerdotal yoke. On the other hand, the extreme Ritualists are writhing under their subjection to the State and to the tribunals of a law which is essentially Protestant, excluding Transubstantiation, the adoration of the Sacrament, and the other special articles and practices of the Ritualist party. In the highly educated classes scepticism is now rife, as it is among the more quick-witted artisans. But upper-class scep-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ticism is by no means universally favorable to disestablishment. On the contrary, upper-class sceptics are not rarely inclined to uphold the established Church as a conservative institution, perhaps also as a security against the religious enthusiasm which is the life of a free Church. Instances could be cited of Anglican Churches built or aided by avowed sceptics on political or social grounds In the cities the Ritualist clergy have of late, by zeal and activity, been deservedly making way. The mind of the city is also to some extent open to æsthetic attractions, which the mind of the peasant is not. By the laboring class in the country the parson is often regarded with jealousy as the confederate of the squire and the farmer, meddling too dictatorially in cottage affairs. The laborer, therefore, is apt to prefer the Nonconformist chapel, where there is no one over his head, to the parish church; though from habit he continues to revert to the parish church for baptism, marriage, and burial. On the whole, the adherents of the Established Church by conviction must now be in a minority. Still the fibres of the institution are so entwined, not only with the religious but with the social organization of the country, that to abolish it would be a difficult operation. The solution of all religious and ecclesiastical questions, however, in England as elsewhere, must depend on the progress of thought, and this is at present tending to the destruction of the theological foundations on which all Churches, established or free, rest. Strange would be the aspect of a country covered with cathedrals and churches from which belief and worship had fled. Yet to this present tendencies point. Statesmen apprehend danger from a Church uncontrolled by the State. The experience of Italy may calm their fears. It will be only necessary to give the Church, with restored self-government and command of such possessions as equity might leave to her, a constitution in which the laity would have a controlling voice, as they have in the Episcopal Church of the United States and Canada. Tithes would be abolished. The edifices, the parsonages, and whatever other portions of the endowments it was thought right to leave to the Church might be held as a State trust for the use and benefit of the Church.

The question of the relation between Church and State in England meanwhile has been brought farcically into discussion by the apparent insults to Roman Catholicism in the King's Cor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

onation formulary as prescribed by the Act of Settlement. The clauses were not really intended as insults, or even as a Protestant demonstration, but as tests which it was with reason assumed that no Catholic conscience could by help of any dispensation or casuistry evade. They were taken from the Test Act, passed in the reign of Charles II., and their efficacy as a bar to the Catholic conscience had been proved in the case of the Duke of York, afterwards James II. It is needless to say that they are now obsolete as well as offensive. Yet to deal with them is not easy, as Lord Salisbury has found. The Orangeman clings to them, and the nation apparently is unwilling, in view of the spread of Ritualism, altogether to dispense with the security for the national religion. But the Roman Catholic opposes the institution or any new Protestant test, while to the Ritualist anything Protestant, especially a denial of the Catholic view of the Sacrament, is hateful. Probably the easiest course, and the one least likely to afford an opening for a fierce theological debate, would be to pass a Declaratory Act confirming the Act of Settlement notwithstanding the omission by the heir to the Crown of any professions or abjurations of religious doctrine therein prescribed.

Disestablishment of the State Church in England would not be without effect in America and the dependencies of Great Britain. The Episcopal Church probably owes its hold upon the rich and fashionable classes in part to its connection with the Anglican hierarchy; and the political influence which it exerts is everywhere akin to that exerted by the hierarchy and clergy in England. In the case of Canada the Church of England could boast that in the struggle for responsible government in 1837 not a single member of the Church of England had been found in arms on the revolutionary side.

A question always standing and coming at fitful intervals to the front is that of "mending or ending" the House of Lords. It is remarkable, though not unnatural, that Great Britain, after leading the march of Europe in political progress, should be the only nation which now retains a hereditary Upper House. A relic of the hereditary system lingers elsewhere, particularly in the Upper House of Austria; but it is manifestly a relic and no more. In Great Britain an attempt was made by Lord Palmerston to introduce the creation of life peerages as a general right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Crown; but it was successfully opposed by Lord Derby, and the only result has been the appointment of four law lords as life peers with salaries to do the work of a court of appeal, which, in that museum of political antiquities, the British Constitution, is still attached to a political assembly. The bishops are lords spiritual, but they seldom venture to take part in any except spiritual questions. They run a risk of being snubbed if they do. For hereditary rank and power hereditary wealth is a necessary qualification. To be created a peer, therefore, a man must either be rich, so as to be able to leave a fortune to his son, or be childless. Surprise was expressed the other day when half a million was granted to Lord Roberts while nothing was granted to General Buller, who, as much as Lord Roberts, had borne the burden and heat of the day. The reason was that Lord Roberts would have a hereditary peerage to maintain. There is a measure of departure from feudalism in cases in which, as in those of Lord Farrer, Lord Lingen, and Lord Hobhouse, the personal name is retained instead of being changed, in feudal fashion, for a territorial title. The hereditary House of Lords may be said to have owed its life to a discreet resignation of power. Since its enforced submission to the popular will in passing the Reform Act of 1832, it has tacitly acquiesced in the understanding that in great questions it retains at most a suspensive veto. Its right to carry opposition so far as to call for a judgment of the nation on the question of the dissolution of Parliament was vehemently denied by Gladstone. On secondary questions it retains and has in not a few cases exercised a power of rejection. Its life, however, is languid and the attendance at its sittings, even on important questions, is scandalously small. Mr. Gladstone presented it with the opportunity of a great success and of a renewal of its hold upon the nation when he allowed it to have the credit of saving the United Kingdom from dismemberment by putting its almost unanimous veto on his Home Rule Bill. His subsequent crusade against it was, as might have been foreseen, a complete failure, and served only to emphasize its victory. Its greatest security, perhaps, is the total absence of any definite plan of reform. The nation would not like to "end" the Upper House and be governed by a single elective chamber; but how to "mend" it nobody seems to know. It is not certain that the House of Commons, or the Liberal party in it, at heart

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desires any such reform in the House of Lords as would make it an equal participant of power. Lord Rosebery playfully flouts the assembly of which he is a gem; but he takes no practical step, nor has he made any definite proposal.

It is desperately difficult for the Liberal party to disentangle itself from the embarrassment into which it was brought by its leader's conversion to Home Rule. Lord Rosebery, when, as Prime Minister, he said that Great Britain was the predominant partner, and that the measure could not pass without her consent, went as near as possible to a practical repudiation. But the Irish delegation is inflexible, and without the Irish vote the Liberals can hardly hope for success. At the same time it may be taken as certain that the nation will never consent to a practical dismemberment which in all probability would establish a hostile nation on its flank. The case of the Irish Nationalists, it must be owned, has been morally strengthened by recent events. To be a member of a peaceful, industrial and commercial kingdom is one thing; to be a member of a militarist and marauding empire, challenging the world to arms, would be another. If the Irish land question could be settled, it is probable, as has been said before, that the political agitation would subside. The Irish land question might most likely have been settled at the cost of a fraction of the sum which is being spent on the subjugation of the Boers. The Irish delegation has held well together and showed force, though the effect has been somewhat marred by Hibernian escapades. If Mr. Chamberlain proceeds, as he threatens, to punish Ireland by a reduction of her representation, he will probably find the North of Ireland united with the South, and a serious undertaking before him.

The Liberal party seems not to be so much broken up or discomfited in the country at large as in the House of Commons. In the bye-elections it still makes a good fight and, though beaten, polls a respectable vote. The common Liberal is simply true to his old flag, and he is unaffected by the personal rivalries and jealousies which have had almost as great an effect as differences of opinion in splitting up the party in the House of Commons.

All this has been said on the assumption that the party system of government is to continue, and that consequently the one thing needed in British politics is a reconstruction of the Opposition.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But is it certainly so? May not the party system of government itself be drawing to an end? May not those who are toiling to patch up an Opposition by forced reconciliations and artificial suppressions be really laboring in vain? May not Lord Rosebery's enigmatic attitude be an index to the future? The place for which he is apparently fitted is that of Foreign Minister in a government free from party.

Party, we have been often solemnly told, is inherent in human nature. "Every one," says the comic opera, "is born a little Conservative or a little Liberal." Nobody doubts that people have by nature different tendencies; some are sanguine, and others cautious. But human nature is not bisected; character varies by infinite gradations. Nor is the same man uniform in his tendencies. He is conservative on one subject, radical on another. As a rule youth is sanguine and age is cautious. Yet there are no more violent reactionists than the youthful members of an aristocracy. On all practical questions men fall naturally into groups of agreement according to their temperaments and their relations to the particular subject. Only in politics do they organize permanent parties and submit their personal convictions and suffrages to the party yoke.

Those who fancy that the party system of government is or ought to be universal, resemble the British footman who said that everybody knew that blue was absurd for a uniform except in the Artillery and the Horse Guards Blue. The party system of government prevailed no doubt in the days of the Guelphs and Ghibellines, when the political domination of the Guelph party was constitutionally recognized at Florence. It may be said to have prevailed in Holland in the seventeenth century. But in recent times it is little more than an accident of British and American history. In England it had its origin, its life, and something like a rational justification in the struggle between the followers of the constitutional House of Hanover and those of the absolutist House of Stuart. Here was a vital issue such as might justify a good citizen in submitting to party discipline on all secondary questions. That issue having been finally decided by the defeat of the Stuarts, the rational and moral basis of party was withdrawn, and there followed a period of "connections" scrambling for the offices of government and vieing with each other in intrigue, jobbery, and corruption. From this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political Malebolge, Chatham sought to rescue the nation by putting all "connections" under his feet and forming a government without party; Burke, by reviving party as a bond of principle, though upon what principle or set of principles Burke's party was to be based he omitted to explain. Both policies were soon merged in the war of the American Revolution, which was carried on by the personal influence of George III., masked under the subserviency of Lord North. Renewed in a very sinister form by the coalition of Fox and North, the party system again failed. Pitt's majority at first was not partisan; it was formed by a national uprising against the unclean coalition, and embraced various elements, some high Tory, others independent or even Radical like Wilkes. Nor did Pitt's Ministry recognize the law of party government which requires the Ministry to resign when it is defeated on any question of importance. It took defeats on the Westminster election, on Parliamentary reform and on free trade with Ireland without any thought of resignation. The outbreak of the French Revolution, by dividing English opinion on a sharp line, once more afforded a rational basis for party. That struggle over, there presently ensued a struggle for reform, Parliamentary and general, which again supplied grounds more or less natural and rational for party organization, though not without an increasing ascendancy of mere faction and cabal, with their necessary effects on the character of government and legislation. There is now apparently a collapse of the system, which every attempt to reconstruct an Opposition makes only more apparent.

In the United States party had its well-known origin in the antagonism between the tendency to Federal centralization represented by Hamilton and the opposite tendency represented by Jefferson. It is not recognized in "The Federalist," nor was it recognized by Washington, who regarded it as a transient ailment to be cured by combining the representatives of the two tendencies in his government. The system, however, has since established itself with a vengeance. It is recognized by law, and has practically overridden the Constitution. Yet foundation, rational or moral, it apparently has none. There are two great standing organizations through which a perpetual competition for power and place is carried on. Neither of them can be said to be based on any distinct and permanent principle or set of prin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciples; each of them, on the eve of a Presidential election, looks about through its managing committee for the planks which are most likely to be popular, and of these makes up its platform. The Republican party at the present time hardly presents any of the special features which it presented when it was fighting against slavery for the Union. The Democratic party at the present day hardly presents any of the special features which it presented when it was the organ of the Southern slave-owner, defending slavery with the help of commercial interests and of the Irish in Northern cities. In the intervals between Presidential elections each of the party organizations is a political tenement to let, possibly for sale; and till the Presidential election approaches nobody can tell exactly what policy will be the next tenant. Mugwumpery is the protest of common sense and national interest against the system, not the less well-founded or significant because it is called by a scornful name.

The British dependencies have in this respect followed in the political wake of the mother country. In Canada seventy years ago there was a struggle for responsible government against the rule of an autocratic Governor and his Camarilla which made the party organization for the time as natural as it was in England during the struggle between the Hanoverians and the Stuarts. That question and all questions connected with it have long since been settled. The parties afterwards became mere factions struggling for place; and their forces being evenly balanced, the struggle ended in a deadlock, a door of escape from which was found for the time in Confederation. At present the parties are mere machines without any distinctive principles, bidding against each other for power and place by the usual arts, with an irresistibly increasing amount of jobbery and corruption. The Canadian people are as worthy and as fit for self-government as any people in the world; but politics are far below the people.

In not one of the great European nations has the party system been successfully applied. In France, Germany and Italy alike, instead of the division into two nearly equal sections which the system requires, there has been a multiplicity of groups, each of them not only with a policy, but with a political ideal of its own, perpetually at war among themselves, but combining against every Ministry that is formed, so that total instability of govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment has ensued. The principal work of a Minister has been, not to guide legislation, but to go about from bench to bench picking up the support of individual members or groups to save his Government from falling. In Germany the Crown has retained a measure of power derived from the leadership of national unification and defence which enables it in some degree to disregard party and to steer a course of its own.

Is the party system of government then to last forever? Are we to regard as final the division of a nation into two organized factions waging a perpetual war of intrigue, calumny, and corruption with each other? Is one-half of the community forever to regard the other half as its political enemy? Is it always to be the duty of a minority to make government in the hands of the majority unpopular and unsuccessful? Can any house thus divided against itself expect to stand?

The system makes all legislation, instead of statesmanlike, more or less demagogic. A proof of this will be found in the history of British legislation on the subject of the electoral franchise. Extension of the franchise may have been, and in fact was, right. But the spirit in which this was done, and which embodied itself in the legislation, was far from being statesmanlike or patriotic. The head of the Conservative party, carrying a sweeping measure of extension, had the hardihood to own that he was taking a leap in the dark, and that he exulted in "dishing the Whigs," of whose party he had once himself been a remarkably violent member.

The place of statesmen is being more and more taken by the stump-orator. To stump-oratory a large share of the public man's time and effort is now given. Two generations ago no British politician of high degree thought of going on the stump, or even of speaking at any election but his own. The present habit is highly injurious to statesmanship. It absorbs the man's energy; it deprives him of time for acquisition of knowledge and for reflection; worst of all, perhaps, it forces him to be perpetually committing himself, for a speaker can hardly amuse and excite a large audience, without saying more than, in his cooler moments, he would deem it prudent to say.

The weakness of government in England of which Lord Rosebery and others complain is probably due in no small measure to the lowering of energy caused by the exhausting demands of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the stump and the nightly work of Parliamentary strife, added to a load of departmental business which in every department has greatly increased. The burden is probably the more exhausting because the men on whom it is laid are commonly not of the class which has been trained to incessant toil.

Switzerland has opened for herself a door and perhaps has indicated a way of escape from the party system. Her Executive Council is elected for a certain term by the Legislative Assembly. It is said that the elections and re-elections are generally decided by administrative merit, and the general result appears to be satisfactory. It seems also that the referendum is worked without respect to party.

England herself has a historic record of an attempt to found a Government on an elective footing, but not on the basis of party. This is the "Instrument of Government," memorable at all events as the outcome of a great debate among political intellects of high calibre and unique experience, at a moment when the nation had completely burst the cerements of the Middle Ages and faced the political problems of modern life. The "Instrument of Government" was buried out of sight and memory under the ruins of a lost cause. But if the decadence of party government continues, the constitution of the Protectorate, as it originally was, with its single elective House of Parliament and its standing Council of State filled by a mixture of election with nomination, may again attract attention, not certainly as a perfect model, but as suggestive of a line.

In the meantime the whole scene will be changed if the vision of the Imperial Federationists is to be realized, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is to be merged in an Anglo-Saxon Empire. This would be the complete reversal of the policy which half a century ago prevailed almost universally among British statesmen, who looked upon the Colonies as destined in time, and probably in no long time, to become independent and make England the mother of free nations. Even Disraeli, whom Jingoism adores as the author of its being, in a letter to his Foreign Secretary, Lord Malmesbury, spoke of the Colonies as "millstones round the neck of England," and destined soon to be independent.

Imperial Federation has been preached in Great Britain and in the Colonies for the last thirty years. The Duke of Man-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chester lent the movement the prestige of his title; he had little in the way of political influence to lend. Hardly any ground was gained by the movement before the Queen's Jubilee, when grandiose ideas of every kind prevailed. In Canada, the Post Office being in high Imperialist hands, the auspicious hour was marked by the issue of a postage stamp in which Canada, habitable and cultivable, was represented as one vast and undivided mass, including the North Pole, forming a great part of the British Empire, and utterly dwarfing Great Britain. The motto was "We Hold a Greater Empire Than Has Been." But since the conquest of the Transvaal and the ascendancy in British politics of Mr. Chamberlain, who, having discarded his socialistic radicalism, is flying the Imperialist kite, a new impulse has been given to Imperial Federation, and its advocates are now confidently looking forward to its triumph. Something indeed, though not of a very decisive kind, has been actually done in that direction. Through the exertions of Mr. Henniker Heaton, a postal confederation has been formed, and the postage of letters has been equalized throughout the Empire, or such parts of it as have at present come into the union. A more momentous step is the participation of Canada and Australia in the South African war; though this, as far as Canada is concerned, has been overstated; while Canadians enlist freely not only in the armies and fleets of Great Britain, but in the United States. There has been much talk of an Imperial Zollverein, but the only step as yet taken towards the fulfillment of that idea has been a preferential reduction of duty on British goods by the Canadian Government, which at present shows no sign of being imitated by the other Colonies, or met by any reciprocal favor on the part of Great Britain. Attempts to induce Great Britain to abandon the policy of free trade, under which her wealth has enormously increased, have met with a succession of rebuffs. Nor has there yet been any attempt to devise a uniform tariff applicable to a number of countries lying wide apart, and varying from each other in their commercial circumstances and their financial needs. The argument commonly used by Zollvereiners that Great Britain, having a short supply of food in herself, and being thus liable to be reduced to famine in the case of maritime war, ought to have the harvests of the Colonists to draw upon, has evidently no force. The Colonies would be involved in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war; their ships would be liable to capture; and they would thus be the very sources of supply on which of all others Great Britain could not draw.

Mr. Chamberlain has just been trying, with the help of Colonial advisers, to construct an Imperial Court of Appeal in which all the Colonies were to be represented, and which was to take the place of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But so far he seems not to have been successful. Perhaps for a good reason. India may require an impartial tribunal such as an Imperial Court of Appeal to guard the legal rights of her subject race; a function which the Privy Council has most admirably fulfilled. But a free Colony is competent to decide the suits of its own people, other, at least, than those which arise under the constitution given it by an Act of the British Parliament. The Colonial judge has the advantage of local knowledge, of which the Court at Westminster is said to have sometimes shown a lack.

Of the political federation of the Empire no scheme has yet been brought forward. When a scheme is called for, the answer is that we must not ask for anything "cut and dry," but rest content with the propagation of the sentiment. Cut and dry or not, there must be a working plan before us before we can commit ourselves to the work. How is the Imperial Legislature to be composed? If Great Britain is to have a representation in proportion to her numbers, the Colonies will be swamped, and there will be discontent among Colonists when they are outvoted. On the other hand, if Great Britain is not represented in proportion to her numbers, there will be discontent among the people of Great Britain. What are to be the powers and the functions of the federal Government? How are its decrees and requisitions to be enforced? What are to be its relations to the British Crown and the Foreign Office? What, again, is to be done with India and her three hundred millions of Hindoos? Is she to be left under the separate rule of Great Britain? In that case control of the army, of the navy, and of diplomacy must be in great measure withdrawn from the federal Government. Or is India to be placed under a federal Government representing all the Colonies and Dependencies? In that case we must pity the Hindoo.

The people of Great Britain know more now about the Colonies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than they did some years ago. A Canadian traveling in England would no longer read a proclamation of the Privy Council in which Ontario was designated as "that town." He would not be congratulated at a public meeting on the settlement of the Alabama claim, as a removal of the last ground of disagreement between Canada and Great Britain. He would not, on introducing his Canadian attendant, be met with a smile of incredulity at the attempt to pass off as Canadian a person who was not red. Yet the masses of the people of England know nothing about the domestic affairs of Canada, while the masses in Canada know almost as little about the domestic affairs of England. Few Canadians could describe the political parties of England; few Englishmen could describe the political parties of Canada. The two nations do not read each other's newspapers; do not know even the names, much less the characters and opinions of each other's public men; they are not at all in touch with each other. The same thing may probably be said with regard to the people of Australia; while South Africa for the present is a wreck. The completion of Australian federation, instead of being a step towards federation of the Empire, in which character it is hailed, is rather a step the other way. It tends to the consolidation of a local nationality, and to the strengthening of local and separatist feeling. A federation of federations would indeed be a political edifice requiring a master hand for its construction, and still more, perhaps, for its support.

The fact is that if you are content with being a nation, you may have a free constitution; if you choose to have an Empire, you must have an Emperor. That this is true will be found by the United States as much as by Great Britain. But the love of territorial aggrandizement has not as yet so far prevailed over the love of liberty that Great Britain is ready to put herself under an Emperor. This sudden and violent plunge into Imperialism and Militarism is not unlikely, unless Great Britain is involved in a great war, to be followed by a recoil.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHINESE EXCLUSION, A BENEFIT OR A HARM?

BY HO YOW, IMPERIAL CHINESE CONSUL-GENERAL.

TWENTY YEARS have now passed since the Chinese exclusion laws of the United States were put into operation, and it may be of advantage at the present time to examine their results, and to consider whether or not they have been a success.

If the success of these laws is to be determined by their effectiveness in keeping Chinese people away from the United States, it must be acknowledged that they have, indeed, most completely realized their purpose; for they have practically cut off communication with China, and in the eyes of that nation have thrown the western world into an attitude of non-intercourse and unfriendliness. The events which have recently dominated the stage of action throughout the Chinese Empire, but particularly along the vastly populous seaboard from north to south, have had their inception in feelings generated among the Chinese people largely by these laws. Those who gloried at the passage of the Scott or the Geary acts, or who took part in smuggling into the appropriation bill of 1894 the amendment which debarred Chinese immigrants from the courts, may now feast their eyes on the logical sequence of their work in the ruins of Tien-Tsin, or in the blood that has washed in the valley of the Pei-ho like a tide.

Those who are honestly trying to convert China to the ideals and economics of the West have been reduced in the propaganda to the barren argument of mere words. It is supposed that China can be raised in this manner to become a source of profit and happiness to the world, through the medium of her production and her consequent purchasing power. No idea was ever more profoundly wrong. There is no nation—and in the nature

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of things there cannot be—which has not grown and does not grow into greatness through reaction from other nations. Nations are no more exempt from the evils of isolation than are individuals. Let any man withdraw from association with his fellows, and dwell without human contact; can such a man be or become a broad, resourceful and progressive mind? Must he not necessarily be selfish, narrow, repellent and misanthropic? So also is it with a nation.

In the fourteenth century the Ming Emperors constructed of brick and mortar in China on the north and west a memorable obstacle to intercourse with the people beyond the border; that barrier is crumbling to ashes, and we have been prone to look upon it as a relic of old China. But this most enlightened nation of the illuminated West, in the height of its glory and splendor, revives what is dead and past with us, and enthrones it into a living, active principle. Bricks and mortar do not comprise the Great Wall which the United States has built against China. It is the old idea, the folly of which we of China have long seen, rehabilitated and swathed in modern attire; its bricks are printed words, and the base upon which it rests is a solemn code; but its parapets are none the less patrolled, and from its battlements gleam the steel of the mediæval soldier.

And yet, the work of the Mings, compared with that of the American Congress, stands as a deed of Providence against one of perversion. The tribes against whom the Great Wall was raised did not seek entrance into China to do the menial work of the Chinese; they did not come intent upon extracting from the soil products which would enrich the Chinese people, while they themselves, performing the toil, would nevertheless be content with a reward of mere crusts. The wall thrown up by the Mings was intended as a defense against robbers; not as a barrier against those who gave value for value, but one against those who pillaged and slew and ravaged with the sword and the torch.

The barricade erected by Congress has no such excuse for being. What are the crimes of which our people are accused that render it needful that we should be treated as hostiles, or shunned as those likely to communicate contagion? What are the charges against us in the alleged truth of which these terrible laws seek justification and tolerance among a people so intelligent and just as are the great body of the Americans? I propose to examine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them in this paper, and in doing so I shall grant the accusers of my people everything they say. I shall concede that the Chinese do, in a sense, work more cheaply than the whites; that they live more cheaply; that they send their money out of the country to China; that most of them have no intention of remaining in the United States, but, after the lapse of years and the accumulation of a competence, reduce their wealth to gold and with it return to their native heaths; and, further, that they do not adopt American manners, but live in colonies and not after the American fashion. Upon the hypothesis of the truth of these assertions I believe I shall prove to the satisfaction of any reasoning mind that each and every one of them represents a condition which is to the highest advantage of this country, and, particularly, to the highest advantage of those who oppose the Chinese laborer, and at whose instance the laws were passed. I shall prove by their own case that the Chinese exclusion laws are fallacious and a mistake; that they are on the statute books unquestionably because the American people do not understand their cause and effect. Moreover, they are a most costly error, not only harmful to China and through China to the world, but visiting upon the United States specifically the most widespread detriment and harm, and depriving the country yearly of millions of dollars. It is distinctly a policy of disaster on a scale so vast as to be without comparison in modern times.

It is a policy founded in ignorance, and arising through passion. A temporary industrial disturbance occurred in San Francisco in the seventies upon the completion of the Central Pacific Railroad, which was built mostly by the Chinese. The Chinese laborers, being released from their occupations, came to San Francisco to hunt for work. The newly running trains from the East brought cargoes of adventurers and fortune hunters, who expected to find immediate employment at high wages upon their arrival. Thereupon arose one of those contests founded upon race prejudice, which have so often marred the pages of the histories of nations. This feeling developed, of course, its own army of political demagogues, who voiced and magnified the conditions and inflamed the passions of the mob. These survive even to this day, though only in a faint and feeble way. Some, like Geary and Kearney, have retired from the disturbance, adopted or resumed professions, and are now leading industrious and respectable lives.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Only occasionally do we hear of a survivor of old sand-lot *sans-cullotism*.

During no period of San Francisco's history was there more general prosperity than existed throughout the era of this agitation. New industries were springing up, agricultural wealth was vastly increasing and oceanic trade was growing by leaps and bounds. The gala days of San Francisco's life and happiness were during the years that preceded 1880. The passage of the exclusion laws operated as a cone over a lighted candle. Chinese residents in California withdrew from industry, reduced their properties to coin, and with it returned to China, scrambling out of a country which they deemed inhospitable and unsafe. Business dried up. Trade with China, which had been advancing at the rate of a million a year, fell off seven millions in two years. It never revived until Dewey's victory. During the interim San Francisco lost two hundred millions of business in her trade with China alone. The city shrank in enterprise and population. When I came to this Consulate over three years ago, the most common feature on the streets was the "to let" signs in the windows of vacant stores and residences. Only when that quarter of the world became stirred by an American impulse did business revive and a few of the placards disappear from the windows. Dewey returned to San Francisco in '98 some fraction of the prosperity of which Scott and his coadjutors had deprived it in '80; but neither Dewey nor Scott could ever give back those untold millions which were lost as an immediate consequence of the legislation the sand-lot mobs produced.

That this agitation against the Chinese could be readily produced under the conditions which then existed by any person or newspaper having the disposition to do so is manifest from a reflection upon the nature of mob uprisings. A few years ago California was stirred from end to end by an agitation against Catholics. Certain of the press teemed with denunciations of this sect and its followers; public speakers talked against the priests and parishioners to crowded throngs; while places of Catholic worship were defiled, the edifices of seminaries besmirched, and the persons of garbed votaries were unsafe in some quarters. But the handicap of the anti-Catholic agitators was that beyond the priests and nuns, who were distinguished by their attire, they were unable to designate who a Catholic was. If all Catholics

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had presented in their appearance a peculiar racial bearing readily recognizable on sight, if these persons had been without votes and unable to protect themselves by political influence, if they had been entering the country in numbers upon every steamer from a foreign land, can it be imagined for a moment that the agitation opposing them would not have been prolonged until Congress granted some appeasing legislation?

As the situation now stands the class for whose supposed benefit the exclusion laws exist, and at whose insistence and dictation they are enforced, are the members of the labor unions. The reason why they are so much interested in the maintenance of these laws is not clear. Among the labor unionists there exists a vague notion that with the Chinese kept out there is less danger of interference when they wield against their employers the instrument of the strike. Unquestionably, if some succor could be devised for the employers, whereby the tyrannies and injustices which many of them suffer at the hands of their employees might be modified, great benefit would accrue, not alone to the employers, but to the cause of industry and the welfare of the State; but, unhappily, such benefit could not be attained through Chinese. The labor unionists are all skilled artisans; the Chinese are wholly unskilled, and are in the main mere laborers or agriculturists.* They could not, under any circumstances, be called to the places of strikers in skilled lines. So that, even from the standpoint of the labor unionist, the Chinese could do the labor unionists no harm.

Aside from the imaginary menace of the Chinaman as a factor in preventing strikes, the labor unionists conceive him to be generally a competitor. This is in no sense a fact. America, paradoxical as the statement may seem, is in many respects the cheapest laboring country in the world. The fabrics, the hardware, the oils and other products which China could produce in abundance are shipped into Hong Kong or Shanghai by pro-

*It is true that in a few lines, particularly cigars, slippers, brooms and rough cotton clothing, Chinese have acquired skill and appeared as producers. But they have never been able to work as dexterously as the Americans, or to turn out in a given time as much product. The cheaper wages paid them for this work were due to the fact that they earn less. This is manifest from the numerous Chinese employers in San Francisco having replaced their Chinese help with whites, thus reversing the Chinese labor question; for were it not for the Chinese employers these particular whites might not have employment; yet, under the administration of the exclusion laws, such manufacturers, being classed as laborers, would not be permitted to return to the United States, should they venture across its border.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ducers of the United States and there sold at prices at which it would be useless for Chinese producers to attempt to compete. Your sawed timber is laid down in the Straits Settlements for two cents per running foot. China, with labor at from eight to twenty cents per day, could not cut it for that price. If it were a fact that the cheap labor of China was the formidable competition the labor unions say it is, you would have no foreign commerce. All the factories in the world would centre in China. China is as rich in natural resources, in deposits of minerals and materials, in agricultural potentialities, as any country on the globe, and vastly richer than many countries. If the materials of nature of which all utilities are made could be worked up there in marketable shape ten per cent. cheaper than elsewhere in the world, all the world's industry would suddenly centre there. If "Chinese cheap labor," as it appeared and would appear on the Pacific Coast with the exclusion acts out of the way, were really cheap labor, it would be the greatest boon for the Pacific Coast within the scope of the imagination. It would cause the movement of nearly all factories thither. Chinese cheap labor would be the magician's wand that would open the soil to life and fill it with fruition. The vast business that would centre here would be an incomputable benefit to every white man and woman; for this vast productiveness would not only open many fields in which Chinese would be unable to enter, but it would create an oceanic and interstate commerce in which there would be profitable business for every one.

But, unfortunately, Chinese labor is not cheap. Compared with the cost of American labor it is dear indeed. This can be readily appreciated when it is recognized that it is the *amount* of wages, and not the *rate* of wages that must be considered in production. The amount of wages is the sum which must be paid to labor out of a given item of its production; the rate of wages is the amount subdivided among all the persons who perform the labor. The amount paid American labor is small compared with the amount which must be paid Chinese labor for the same work, but the rate paid American labor, being the share each individual receives, is high compared with that received by the Chinese. Consequently, while the amount paid Chinese labor would be high, the rate would be low. This is because of the superior efficiency of the American laborer. One American with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a machine will do more work than twenty hand-laboring Chinese. Even without a machine the American will, by superior methods and better tools, do the work of a number of Chinamen. If it be said that the Chinese will also learn to use the machines, the answer is that they do not, except in isolated instances. There is nothing now, and there never has been anything, to prevent the Chinese from importing any machine you have, setting it into operation, and with the use of cheap labor producing cheaper than you. Yet this is not done, and in those centres where they have erected cotton mills which are being operated by coolies their goods are not being produced as cheaply as the same commodities are being manufactured in Massachusetts, though the number of employees is perhaps as eight to one.* Take, for instance, the Soy Che cotton mills in Shanghai. They run two shifts and employ 2,200 persons. A factory of the same capacity in New Jersey would employ from 300 to 350 persons. In the engine room of the Soy Che sixty-five men are required. In an American mill their work would be done by two engineers, two helpers and two firemen. It is a characteristic of employment in the Far East that service in all departments is finely subdivided and employment given to as many persons as possible. The compensation *per capita* is accordingly small, but the labor cost of the commodity manufactured is as great and generally greater than here.

The rate of wages of the American laborer has been increased disproportionately above the rate paid to laborers in other countries by the fact that the American works with a machine. The power of his hand is multiplied by the device which operates between his fingers and the finished product. He becomes not a worker in wools, in wood or metal, as does the Chinese artisan, but a manipulator of a mechanism which finds not its power but its guidance in his muscles.

When, however, our people acquire a knowledge of the use of machines and equal facility in manufacturing them as have your laborers, they will demand and receive their full due in rate of wages. Now, if they get ten cents per day, they get all they earn; if your laborer gets two dollars a day, it is for no other reason than that he earns it. This is invariably the case; it is a feature of the law of wages. Designate a given quantity of work, and whoever performs it will receive the same pay. Take the case

*See report of Consul-General Goodnow, U. S. Consular Reports, June, 1900, p. 204.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of women setting type. The question is not the sex, age or color of the performer of the work; it is the extent and quantity of the work done. No laborer would work by the day, if he could do better at piecework, and employers generally welcome and often force the change from day to piecework; for then they know precisely what they pay for it and what they are getting.

But beyond the question as to whether Chinese labor is really cheap or dear there is another reason which holds the labor unionist to demand the exclusion of the Chinese. This reason they do not preach among the multitude, but nevertheless every labor unionist feels it deep down within him, because his very organization is based upon it. It is that "demand arises from scarcity, and it is the duty and purpose of the labor unionist to see that a sufficient scarcity of commodities is maintained to keep always a demand for labor in producing them. If the Chinese came in freely, too much would be produced; there would come periods of over-production, when there would be a general shut down until consumption caught up with production again, and white labor would be the sufferers." This is, in substance, the golden text and decalogue of the labor unionist. To promote this they are constantly tending to shorten the hours of labor, so that there will be work enough to go around.

This doctrine is false and ruinous—ruinous not alone to the country that tolerates it, but to the ignorant men who propagate it and act upon it. If it were true, every machine in the world should properly be smashed, for as they are harbingers of plenty they must all be enemies of labor. Indeed, your English historian tells a sorry tale of the "frame-breaking" and other riots which occurred among the working classes of England upon the introduction of labor-saving machinery; how they stormed the mills and factories, and destroyed the mechanisms which were depriving them of their long-time jobs. But presently we observed how those same people, who before knew nothing but wooden clumpers, had come to wear leather shoes; how the erstwhile owner of a single hand-knit jerkin acquired two and three suits of woolen cloth how he abolished his thatched for a shingle roof. All this was the result of machinery.

The real demand, the demand upon which the world thrives, is not created by scarcity but by plenty. Properly speaking, there is no such thing as a demand caused by scarcity; or if there is such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a thing, it is that elementary demand which primitive man gratified with a well-aimed stone—the demand for food for his belly and fur for his back. But the demand upon which commerce rests is that created by taste, and to taste there is set no limit. Through his adherence to the doctrine of scarcity, through basing his economic attitude toward the world upon this false ground, the labor unionist is really dooming himself to poverty. He is steadily reducing and holding down his own wages, through making high in the market all commodities which he must consume, and to obtain which is the object of his work. Any means, therefore, by which the labor unionist effects scarcity of a commodity is against his own interest, and any means by which plenty is attained is to his benefit.

Let me illustrate. Suppose that in a particular district a few potatoes were raised. If the consumption of potatoes there were limited to those produced in the place, potatoes would be a luxury in which only the rich might indulge. The demand for potatoes there would be a demand produced by scarcity. But next year a larger crop is grown, and potatoes fall to within reach of the very poor. And again, a still larger crop is raised and potatoes come to be fed to the hogs and poultry, and thus turned into other forms of wealth. Poultry and hogs are grown, which before were not grown; they have been called into existence by the abundance of potatoes. Still a larger crop, and science and invention enter; potatoes are made into starch, into celluloid; they are grated and dried, and so become an article of commerce and are exported. Thus does the very plentitude of potatoes create a demand for potatoes, a demand which did not exist and was never dreamed of while potatoes were scarce, or while they were produced only to supply the demands which scarcity invoked.

So then I assert it as a postulate that demand for labor arises from the presence of wealth in a community—not stocks, bonds, land value (as distinguished from land) and other intangibles—but material products. For every pound of food that is taken from the soil, every pound of material for human comfort or desires (it matters not how great the quantity) will go to a consumer, and will make haste to reach him as rapidly as those behind can urge it on; and, on its way thither, it will employ an infinite number of heads and hands, paying every one it touches.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not only does greater material wealth in a community increase the opportunity of laborers for employment, it raises their wages. For the products thus created must be consumed, and the laborers are of those who must consume them. If there is much to be consumed, their industrial share will be larger; if there is little to be consumed, their shares will be accordingly less; and the share, whether it be large or small, is the wages which the laborer receives. We call a man rich; but he is not rich because he possesses an excess of material wealth, but because he commands the means to possess material wealth. Of such wealth itself he will not have a great deal more than any one else. He will not have in his house over a few dozens of eggs and a few pounds of butter. He may have half a dozen suits of clothes, but more would be a burden to him. The balance of the butter, eggs and clothes that are produced must go to other consumers, and the more of these things there are in that community, the greater will be the distributive share of every person in it.

Nor is this law influenced by the phenomenon of so-called "overproduction." There is no such thing as "overproduction" of things desired. This kind of congestion is simply a proclamation of the presence of a clog in the channel between the producer and the consumer. More than likely, the demands of the labor unionists on the mill owners have caused the product to be produced at a cost too great to allow of its being sold in the market without a loss. Consequently, the labor unionist experiences a reaction, due to his transgressing the natural law; the mill is shut down, and he is thrown out of employment. Or, perhaps, the merchants of some great consuming nation like China have become infuriated by the treatment their countrymen have received through laws adopted at the instigation of labor unionists, and they refuse to buy the product of the labor unionists' work. Then it is that you have "overproduction," and the products of your thousand mills, which to the consumers of China would be as a fleck of foam on the sea, stay here and stagnate and breed disturbance, and new sets of restrictive resolutions perpetuating scarcity and distress are passed by the labor unions.

One of the greatest and most potential instruments for the creation of wealth is the Chinese laborer. To the unclouded mind it seems preposterous that any people should be shunned and ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pelled from a country that counts its unused acres by millions, simply because those people are industrious, patient and frugal laborers who would produce for you at small cost—assuming, for the sake of argument, that this is the case! Time was in California when the arrival of an able-bodied man of mature age, capable and willing to work, was accounted an accretion of one thousand dollars in wealth to the State. It was reasoned that another place had brought that man into existence and nurtured him through years of feebleness; now that he was strong and able he had come here. In those days, the Chinese laborer was received by the white laborer with fraternal greeting. The historian, Hittel, tells how white and yellow laborers marched in one industrial procession through the streets of San Francisco, as it was proper they should march, and as they would to-day were it not that the laboring people are being constantly misled and wrongly taught on this Chinese question by mischievous persons.

Merchants of the Pacific Coast talk of the vast market of the Orient for their goods. That market is as truly closed to them as the lips of a Shan-tung oyster! Professor Davidson tells us that in 1897 the trade of the Pacific amounted to over two thousand millions of dollars. Of this fifty per cent. went to England. The share of the United States was less than seven per cent., and that part which fell to San Francisco was too fractional to consider. San Francisco could as easily have had the fifty per cent., but in order to get it she must have had Chinese labor. Not that Chinese labor would hurt the wages of the white laborer, but it would so vastly, so enormously increase the volume of wealth that industry would spring up on every hand. The demand for labor would be a thousandfold greater than it is at present. Commodities of all kinds would be greatly cheaper than now and wages would be correspondingly higher. I say "wages would be correspondingly higher," and by that I mean that wages would then be really higher, as they are now artificially high; for the question as to whether wages are high or low is not determined by how much coin the laborer receives, but by what he gets for the coin. Amidst a condition of great plenty and corresponding cheapness of the material things which men desire, human exertion would be the only thing that would be high. Men do not work unless compelled by their material needs to do so. If they can procure all that they wish by a trifling exertion, they will not put forth greater exertion unless the wages are high enough.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But your labor unionist fears this plenty. He believes he wants work, and he seeks to create and maintain conditions which he thinks "make work." The truth is that work is the very last thing he does want. What he actually wants is the products for the obtaining of which he sees no other means than work. But suppose that the Orient, instead of being full of human laborers, should be full of inorganic laborers, to wit, machines. And suppose these machines should be brought here and set up, and that they should be so finely devised that they would entirely abolish and do away with human labor, and that henceforth there would be work for no one. Press a button or turn a knob, and all of material service or commodities the human heart desires would be forthcoming in overwhelming abundance. In whatever direction the out-of-work laborer would turn he would be confronted with one of these inexorable Asiatic machines, turning out produce so cheaply and of such exquisite finish that no hand could compete with it! Would that condition, I ask, be harmful or beneficial to your white laborer? He would be stripped of work, his occupation would be gone; and yet would he starve? Would he even feel discomfort or inconvenience? Would it not be a fact that, amidst such prodigality of good things, there would be abundance for every one? So much material to be consumed would upon some pretext or other find consumers, and your laborer would secure his share, even if he returned no service whatever. But he would return a service. Released from the drudgery of menial toil, your laborer would aspire to higher things—learning, art, science, the aspirations of the soul and the pleasures of the mind. He would rise above drudgery, cease to be a slave, and become a fully rounded and noble man.

And, after all, this imaginary machine is not a mere figment of my thought. Is not the condition which it would produce the very condition to which your Western civilization is tending, to which you have in a large measure attained? Is it not the province of every machine you have to lighten human toil, to increase human comforts, even to abolish within its sphere human toil and convert it into a mere mental exercise? And yet the Asiatic laborer, taken in all the aspects in which he is obnoxious to the labor unionist, is not worse than the machine. You say the Chinaman labors cheaply; he does not labor as cheaply as a machine. You say he sends his money to China; you

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are sending money to Europe to buy machines. In every aspect in which you regard the question, in every test that you apply, you find that the argument against the Asiatic laborer falls to the ground.

His opponents in combating his coming overlook the prime consideration, that he is a *laborer,* that he is a *producer,* a creator of wealth in the fullness of which they share. Their arguments against him would apply only were he a consumer and not a producer. If he were this, or if he consumed all he produced, then they would have no complaint. Being a non-worker—say, for instance, a land owner—they would have no objection to him. He would apparently be welcomed here. Suppose the Chinese when they discovered the Pacific Coast, long before the era of Columbus, had remained here, and suppose the United States had appeared later, and acknowledged the Chinamen's title. Suppose the Chinese had let the lands on rentals to the Americans, and later some thousands of millions of their heirs or assigns had sailed from China and come hither and settled. They would not come to work; they would come to see the labor unionist work, and to take from him a portion of his earnings as land toll. There we have an instance of a consumer who is not a producer, and such Chinamen would have unquestionably been welcomed in California. But instead of being a benefit economically he would have been a nuisance; yet the labor unionist would have regarded him as an institution of benevolence and benignity—one who distributes his money in the purchase of their products and who does not compete with them in the "labor market."

Suppose the Chinaman consumed all the material wealth that he earned. Would not the quantity of such wealth in the community be thereby reduced, and would there not be so much less left for others to consume? The fact that the Chinaman does not consume all his share is of the highest advantage to you. If he claimed his full share and ate it all, he would be in one aspect an influence promoting scarcity; if he were an epiphyte—if he could live on air alone—so that he would work on and produce and leave it all for you to consume and profit by, would it not be better for you? It would certainly have to find consumers, and the abundance which he leaves would go to increase your share.

The Chinese exclusion laws were passed to appease laborers with whom the Chinese did not and could not compete. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chinese, then as now, were mostly employed as agriculturists and in the performance of work which an American would not do. No American wishes to do menial drudgery, and it is in commendation of his character that he spurns this kind of service. The people who wanted, or pretended to want, to do Chinese labor were not Americans, but European foreigners, persons who had but recently parted with conditions in their native countries not better than those which the Chinaman had left in his, and who no sooner reached America than they joined in the clamor against extending to the people of the Pacific that free access to the country which they themselves had just enjoyed upon the Atlantic. In point of fact the immigration which has come to the United States from Asia has been in all respects as good as that which has come from Europe. In some respects it has been a great deal better; for we have never aided thither paupers, criminals nor insane persons, and this slough comprised so considerable a percentage of the European immigration that it became necessary for Congress to enact a law extending to them the treatment which it visits upon the Chinese.

Thus we admit that the Chinese do work cheaper than whites, but when they work cheaper they actually earn less; when they do equal work—or, in other words, when they are worth as much as whites—they are paid as much, and the wages of either white man or Chinaman are determined and limited by what the commodity upon which it is exerted brings in the open market.

The sandlotist, however, acclaims that the presence of the Chinese are an injury in that they send much gold out of the country, and that, consequently, such does not circulate from hand to hand within the country and stimulate business. But I shall show that this is a benefit to the American people.

In the first place, the sending away of gold by Chinese does not and cannot produce a scarcity of money. There is no such thing as a real scarcity of money. There never has been. In the height of your bank panics there was no scarcity of money. All the money was in the country that was here the day or the week before the panic came on. The panic was due to the fact that money ceased to be exchanged. Let the Chinese send to China every wafer of gold that they can hoard. It will be but slightly missed, and presently it will perform its work there, when, if intercourse be free, it will come floating back on new missions of commerce and consequent benefit.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

You are trying to civilize China after the Western idea of civilization, which I am ready to admit is vastly better than our idea of civilization. You conceive that to inculcate your ideas upon all these vast millions of people will result immeasurably to your benefit, and you are right in that. To achieve this you are willing to spend millions a year in sending your missionaries thither, sending consuls, supporting them with armies, demanding rights for your shippers of goods, etc. Yet the most potential and effective engine for the achievement of this very end is the pieces of Western coin which are sent to China by Chinese residing in the West.

The money which they send goes to their relatives and friends. This leavens the common people; and in leavening them it lifts the whole Empire. It brings comfort to them; it draws their minds close to your country; it makes them receptive to your ideas, ready for the acceptance of your methods. Not only do the Chinese here send their gold in amongst them, but your goods also. Chinese are great givers of presents, and great quantities of your products enter their Chinese homes in this manner. All the influences, missionaries, armies, treaties whereby the Western world is trying to turn China its way would not and never can equal the power to the same end exerted by the quiet movement of small sums of money from the sons and husbands in the West going with presents and comforts into the homes of the lowly Chinese.

This movement of money to the parent country is most natural, and the Chinese in so sending money are but performing an act which has been in accord with human action under like conditions ever since migration first set in from one civilized country to another. You are now sending millions annually to Europe, which go out of the purses of European emigrants settled here, to their relatives in the "old country." Perhaps in sending this money these people are performing acts of pure duty and charity, and perhaps they are feathering nests there for themselves, against the day of their intended return; for no emigrant, leaving a country to try his fortune abroad, but designs at starting to return to his old home and there spend his waning days.

But with their New World wealth they have carried New World ideas. They have learned how to develop their own country; or, becoming familiar with American goods, they perceived

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the kind that could be sold most advantageously in their own country. Upon their return they opened importing establishments and so extended the trade of America. The returned Chinese have done all this. They have introduced American ideas, American goods, and planted American desires in Hong Kong and the Kwang-tung district.

But one count in the indictment remains. It is that the Chinese do not assimilate with the American people and do not adopt American methods and ways. If we would cut our queues, quit shaving our heads, abolish the *yung-shan* and wear the American coat and vest, this objection would not be raised. Our people would make as good citizens of the United States as any other foreign-born peoples. The average business man amongst us would vote as intelligently as the average business man among the European foreign element, and the same may be said of our laborers. This whole trouble has been caused by the fact that we are not citizens and voters. The wisdom of Chief Justice McColl of the Dominion Government was never more brilliantly shown than when in a recent Japanese case he declared that "it was a menace to Canada to have a large number of Japanese living in Canada, and to exclude them from taking part in the legislation affecting their property and civil rights." The evil and loss to which the United States has been subjected in its relation with China would all have been avoided had the Chinese been treated the same as any other aliens in the matter of naturalization. With votes in the hands of any considerable number of Chinese the exclusion laws would never have been possible. What if we do live in colonies? All your cities are but bunches of colonies. One does not have to contrast the foreign colonies in San Francisco, for instance, the Chinese with the Latin, or the Germans with the French or Hebrews; one may remark the colony on Nob Hill, and observe the chasm that separates it from that in the Mission or on Tar Flat. The Chinese gather to themselves, and do not trespass upon the domestic life of your people. Did Chinese sprinkle themselves all over the city, we should find their so doing would be put forward as one of the strongest objections to their presence.

Thus falls every argument presented on behalf of Chinese exclusion, and by which the existing extraordinary Congressional laws are sustained. If there were a real Chinese grievance, if the laws were justifiable, I should not write this article. If the laws

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were harmful only to my own people, I should be content to hold my peace upon the theory that Americans had a right to inflict upon other people whatever disadvantages their own benefits might dictate. But the condition is not that. The condition is that a certain aggregate of mischievous persons have imposed upon the ignorance and credulity of your laboring people and caused them to demand the passage of laws resulting infinitely to their own harm, and that the sole and only motive these agitators have had for their acts is to increase their own pecuniary gain. It is my profound hope that the laboring people of America will now see these questions in the light of truth, and that they may become aroused to the injury which these laws are doing them. They should appreciate fully that they, above all other members of the community, are most interested in the increase of the stock of material wealth within the community, and that the most helpful hand in this increase that they can possibly enlist is the patient, faithful and diligent activity of the Chinese laborer. Nor does the question concern the business man less; the fewer goods there are in the community, the fewer goods he will have to move; and to create these is all the privilege the Chinese asks. The greatness of the United States demands the trade of the Orient, and the Orient is China. The United States cannot get this trade without cultivating friendly intercourse with her people.

America cannot fight China's people and enjoy those benefits which can only arise through peace and good feeling. Even now the class of Chinese who could confer most advantage on America and our country by coming to the United States never thinks of coming. This class recoils from the thought of subjecting itself to the insult and imprisonment which are inflicted upon every Chinese person seeking entrance to the United States under the exclusion laws. Only a few returning laborers and a handful of merchants of the poorer class ever try to enter the United States. America has cut away from herself a nation which by simple justice and fairness of treatment she might mould to her own advantage. This cutting off has been done, and is now being done, in blind ignorance under the erroneous belief that it is benefiting the people it is most seriously harming.

Ho Yow.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS THE RUSH-BAGOT CONVENTION IMMORTAL?

BY THE HON. HENRY SHERMAN BOUTELL.

SINCE April 29, 1817, when the agreement between the United States and Great Britain, commonly called the Rush-Bagot Convention, was concluded, it has successfully resisted all efforts to modify or annul it, although for more than half a century it has been practically obsolete. For the past sixty years both parties have violated the agreement with the same persistency with which they have both maintained at all times that the agreement was in full force and effect, and its faithful observance essential to their mutual welfare.

It has often been maintained by diplomatists and statesmen that the true spirit of the Rush-Bagot Convention has never been violated by either of the parties thereto. On the other hand, many practical men of affairs insist that a rigid compliance with the letter of the Convention is now working a great injustice to certain important American industries, and that, as this literal interpretation relates to matters which were not considered when the contract was made, it is not in harmony with the spirit of the agreement. During the last few years Congress has shown a disposition to enquire into the sources of the perennial vitality of this Convention, and to ascertain whether a prolongation of its existence is for the best interests of the United States. The subject will undoubtedly come before Congress again at its next session, and steps will probably be taken to secure the abrogation or modification of the Convention. Some account, therefore, of the origin and history of this singular agreement, concerning which there is such a diversity of opinion, may be of general interest at this time.

In 1815, at the close of the war between the United States and Great Britain, each country had a considerable naval force

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the Northern Lakes. The reduction of this force was essential to a permanent peace. Nevertheless, in the latter part of the summer of 1815, Mr. John Quincy Adams, our Minister to Great Britain, forwarded to this government evidence that Great Britain, instead of disarming her lake fleet, was making plans to increase its size and efficiency. This determination on the part of the British Government led Mr. Monroe, our Secretary of State, on November 16, 1815, to write to Mr. Adams instructing him to propose to the British authorities a mutual disarmament on the Great Lakes. Mr. Adams promptly took up the subject with Lord Castlereagh, the British Secretary of Foreign Affairs; but after six months of negotiation with him no conclusion had been reached. By July, 1816, the British Minister to the United States, Right Honorable Charles Bagot, had received authority from his government to treat with our Secretary of State relative to disarmament on the lakes. The terms of the arrangement, as finally agreed upon, were suggested by Mr. Monroe in a letter to Mr. Bagot, dated August 2, 1816. In this letter Mr. Monroe said:

"I have the honor now to state that the President is willing, in the peace which so happily exists between the two nations and until the proposed arrangement shall be canceled in the manner hereinafter suggested, to confine the naval force to be maintained on the lakes on each side to the following vessels, that is: On Lake Ontario to one vessel not exceeding 100 tons burthen and one 18-pound cannon, and on the Upper Lakes to two vessels of like burthen and force, and on the waters of Lake Champlain to one vessel not exceeding the like burthen and force; and that all other armed vessels on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled, and likewise that neither party shall build or arm any other vessel on the shores of those lakes.

"That the naval force thus retained by each party on the lakes shall be restricted in its duty to the protection of its revenue laws, the transportation of troops and goods, and to such other services as will in no respect interfere with the armed vessels of the other party.

"That should either of the parties be of opinion hereafter that this arrangement did not accomplish the object intended by it, and be desirous of annulling it, and give notice thereof, it shall be void and of no effect after the expiration of —— months from the date of such notice."

The method adopted for carrying out the understanding between the two governments was the diplomatic device known as an interchange of notes. On April 28, 1817, Mr. Bagot wrote to Richard Rush, our Acting Secretary of State, as follows:

WASHINGTON, *April* 28, 1817.

The undersigned, His Britannic Majesty's envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, has the honor to acquaint Mr. Rush that,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

having laid before His Majesty's Government the correspondence which passed last year between the Secretary of the Department of State and the undersigned upon the subject of a proposal to reduce the naval force of the respective countries upon the American lakes, he has received the commands of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent to acquaint the Government of the United States that His Royal Highness is willing to accede to the proposition made to the undersigned by the Secretary of the Department of State in his note of the 2d of August last.

His Royal Highness, acting in the name and on the behalf of His Majesty, agrees that the naval force to be maintained upon the American lakes by His Majesty and the Government of the United States shall henceforth be confined to the following vessels on each side, that is—

On Lake Ontario to one vessel not exceeding 100 tons burden and armed with one 18-pound cannon.

On the Upper Lakes to two vessels not exceeding like burden each and armed with like force.

On the waters of Lake Champlain to one vessel not exceeding like burden and armed with like force.

And His Royal Highness agrees that all other armed vessels on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled, and that no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed. His Royal Highness further agrees that if either party should hereafter be desirous of annulling this stipulation, and should give notice to that effect to the other party, it shall cease to be binding after the expiration of six months from the date of such notice.

The undersigned has it in command from His Royal Highness the Prince Regent to acquaint the American Government that His Royal Highness has issued orders to His Majesty's officers on the lakes directing that the naval force so to be limited shall be restricted to such services as will in no respect interfere with the proper duties of the armed vessels of the other party.

The undersigned has the honor to renew to Mr. Rush the assurances of his highest consideration. CHARLES BAGOT.

To this note Mr. Rush sent the following reply on the next day:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *April* 29, 1817.

The undersigned, Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Bagot's note of the 28th of this month, informing him that, having laid before the Government of His Britannic Majesty the correspondence which passed between the Secretary of State and himself upon the subject of a proposal to reduce the naval force of the two countries upon the American lakes, he has received the commands of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent to inform this Government that His Royal Highness was willing to accede to the proposition made by the Secretary of State in his note of the second of August last.

The undersigned has the honor to express to Mr. Bagot the satisfaction which the President feels at His Royal Highness the Prince Regent's having acceded to the proposition of this Government as contained in the note alluded to. And in further answer to Mr. Bagot's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

note, the undersigned, by direction of the President, has the honor to state that this Government, cherishing the same sentiments expressed in the note of the second of August, agrees that the naval force to be maintained upon the lakes by the United States and Great Britain, shall, henceforth, be confined to the following vessels on each side, that is—

On Lake Ontario to one vessel not exceeding 100 tons burden, and armed with one 18-pound cannon. On the Upper Lakes to two vessels not exceeding the like burden each, and armed with like force, and on the waters of Lake Champlain to one vessel not exceeding like burden and armed with like force.

And it agrees that all other armed vessels on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled, and that no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed. And it further agrees that if either party should hereafter be desirous of annulling this stipulation and should give notice to that effect to the other party, it shall cease to be binding after the expiration of six months from the date of such notice.

The undersigned is also directed by the President to state that proper orders will be forthwith issued by this Government to restrict the naval force thus limited to such services as will in no respect interfere with the proper duties of the armed vessels of the other party.

The undersigned eagerly avails himself of this opportunity to tender to Mr. Bagot the assurances of his distinguished consideration and respect. RICHARD RUSH.

This correspondence constitutes the compact which has been binding upon the two countries for over eighty-four years. By the statesmen and publicists of both countries it has been variously termed an arrangement, agreement, convention and treaty.

It was nearly a year after the exchange of notes that, on April 6, 1818, President Monroe submitted to the Senate the correspondence between Mr. Rush and Mr. Bagot. Ten days later the Senate, by the unanimous vote of thirty Senators, approved the agreement, and, on April 28th, the President published it in a proclamation.

It does not appear that the action of Mr. Bagot was ever formally confirmed by his government, and no exchange of ratifications took place. But we assumed that Mr. Bagot had full power and authority to bind his government, and Great Britain has acted on the assumption that Mr. Rush was duly authorized and empowered to contract on behalf of the United States. The agreement, therefore, although concluded in an unconventional manner, and partaking of none of the ordinary characteristics of a formal treaty, must be considered as possessing all the binding force and effect of a treaty. As such it has been, since April 29, 1817, a part of the supreme law of the land.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The agreement became immediately operative upon the interchange of notes, and the work of dismantling the fleets was promptly begun. In a short time the victorious ships of Perry and McDonough were rotting on the sands, or had been converted into peaceful merchantmen.

It may perhaps aid us in arriving at a just conclusion respecting the questions which arise in connection with this Convention, and the proper attitude of the United States toward them, to consider (I.) the circumstances under which the agreement was made, and the objects which were sought to be accomplished by it; (II.) the manner in which the parties have observed the Convention, and the interpretations which they have placed upon it; (III.) the reasons which have been given for its abrogation or modification.

I.

A knowledge of the environment of the contracting parties is essential to an intelligent interpretation of every contract. The conditions which surrounded the framers of this Convention differed so radically from the conditions which exist to-day, that a literal compliance with the terms of the agreement is little less than absurd, inasmuch as it often produces results which were not intended, or even contemplated, by the parties.

In 1817 the navies of the United States and Great Britain on the lakes were about evenly matched, and numbered some twenty-five wooden vessels each. No iron or steel vessels then existed, and steam had not yet been used in ships of war. There was no communication for vessels from one lake to another, except from Lake Erie to Lake Huron and from Lake Huron to Lake Michigan, and there was no passage from the lakes to the ocean. The Welland Canal was not opened for small vessels until 1833, and the chain of St. Lawrence canals was not completed until 1848. The shores of the lower lakes were sparsely settled, and the region of the upper lakes was an unexplored wilderness inhabited by savages. The chain of lakes was the only pathway of commerce to the West and Northwest. The war had left the Americans and Canadians along the border in bad humor and not at all disposed to treat one another in a neighborly manner. The presence on the lakes of large fleets of armed vessels, recently opposed to each other, hindered a recon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciliation and the establishment of friendly commercial intercourse.

These were the conditions which existed when Secretary Monroe wrote to Mr. Adams, in November, 1815. The thought that was uppermost in the minds of the framers of the Convention was the necessity for the immediate removal of the greatest obstacle to a good understanding between the two countries by the disarmament of the naval force on the lakes. Their main object was to secure a present reduction of the existing force. They were less concerned about the more remote future. This is apparent from the correspondence which preceded and constituted the agreement. The subject under consideration was the "Proposal to reduce the naval force of the respective countries on the American lakes." Of this force four vessels were to be "maintained," or "retained," by each party, and all other armed vessels were forthwith to be dismantled.

Three facts are especially to be noted in connection with the terms of the agreement.

First. Except for the four vessels agreed upon, no other vessels of war were to be "maintained," "built" or "armed" on the lakes. As there was no navigable connection between the lakes, or between Lake Ontario and the ocean, when Mr. Bagot and Mr. Rush used these terms, they understood that a vessel could not be maintained upon the lakes unless it had been built there, and that a vessel could not be armed or built on the lakes and maintained elsewhere. They did not contemplate a time when vessels larger than the largest warships with which they were then familiar could pass to and fro between the ocean and the headwaters of Michigan and Superior. From their point of view, to build on the lakes was to maintain on the lakes.

Second. The only restriction that Mr. Bagot in his note specifically places upon the vessels to be maintained by each power is that they shall "in no respect interfere with the proper duties of the armed vessels of the other party." He does, however, state in the first paragraph of his note that "His Royal Highness is willing to accede to the proposition made to the undersigned by the Secretary of the Department of State in his note of the 2d of August last." Now, a part of Secretary Monroe's proposition was that the naval force to be retained by each party should be restricted in its duty "to the protection of its revenue laws, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

transportation of troops and goods, and to such other services as will in no respect interfere with the armed vessels of the other party." It was clearly the intention that the four vessels agreed upon should be the only armed ships maintained by either government on the lakes for any purpose.

Third. The agreement makes no provision for any temporary deviations from the strict letter of the contract. It takes no account of the necessities of civil war, or of the duty of each party to maintain the neutrality of its own citizens.

As an arrangement for immediate mutual disarmament, the Convention was effective and beneficial to both parties. It was a distinct aid in bringing about a better feeling between the people along the border. It stimulated commerce on the lakes and encouraged settlement along their shores. The agreement worked smoothly during the first twenty years of its life. It injured no one and was of undeniable advantage to both parties. By the end of twenty years it probably had done all that its framers expected of it, and, in the opinion of many, it had accomplished all the good of which it was capable.

II.

Changed conditions and unforeseen events speedily demonstrated that a literal compliance with the agreement was impracticable, and might be suicidal. Great Britain first felt the necessity of transgressing the letter of the contract. During the revolution in Canada of 1838 the British authorities increased their naval armament on the lakes beyond the limits fixed in the agreement, for the purpose of defending their shores from the incursions of small bands of so-called "Canadian Patriots."

This increase of the naval force led our Secretary of State, Mr. Forsyth, to remonstrate to Mr. Fox, the British Minister. Mr. Fox replied that the increase was made necessary in consequence of unlawful and piratical acts of hostility; that the armament was equipped for the sole purpose of guarding Her Majesty's Province against a manifest and acknowledged danger, and that it would be discontinued at the earliest possible period after the causes which created the danger had ceased to exist. This reply satisfied Mr. Forsyth for a year, when he again called the attention of Mr. Fox to the matter and suggested that, the causes for the increase in the armament having ceased to exist,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the President expected that the British force would be reduced to the limits fixed by the Convention.

This reminder of her treaty obligations did not deter Great Britain from laying plans for a still further increase in her naval force on the lakes. This action brought forth a protest from Mr. Webster, who had become Secretary of State. In replying to Mr. Webster's notes, Mr. Fox stated that the vessels of war serving on the Canadian lakes were equipped for the sole purpose of guarding Her Majesty's Province against hostile attack. With a touch of sarcasm he added that the hostile incursions with which Canada was threatened were from combinations of armed men unlawfully organized and prepared for war in the United States, in defiance of the efforts of the government to prevent them. The explanation made by Mr. Fox apparently satisfied Mr. Webster, although he had originally insisted upon a rigid compliance with the terms of the Convention.

In the meantime Congress had done something besides protest. The Fortification Act of September 9, 1841, contained a clause authorizing the construction and armament of such vessels on the lakes as the President might think proper, and such as should "be authorized by the existing stipulations between this and the British Government." Under this authority the iron, side-wheel bark Michigan was built at Pittsburg and taken in sections to Erie, where she was completed and launched in the summer of 1844. She registered 498 tons and carried two 8-inch guns and four 32-pound carronades.

It was now Great Britain's turn to remonstrate. All immediate necessity for increasing her navy had disappeared, and so her Minister, Mr. Packenham, conveyed to Secretary Calhoun his conviction that it was by all means desirable that the Convention of 1817 should be fulfilled to the letter by both contracting parties. Mr. Calhoun's reply merely refers to an enclosed note of the Secretary of the Navy, to whom he had referred Mr. Packenham's communication. The reasons given by Mr. Mason, Secretary of the Navy, for our violation of the agreement were that Great Britain was violating the agreement, and that the methods of naval construction had greatly changed since 1817. On the latter point he wisely said: "It is worthy of remark that at the date of the agreement between the two Governments steamers were in use to a very limited extent as passenger ves-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sels, and perhaps not at all as ships of war. The restriction as to tonnage would probably not have been adopted if their use had been anticipated. No effective steamer for any purpose, it is believed, would be built of a tonnage of 100 tons."

Either the British Ministry took thirteen years to consider and digest this suggestion, or the Michigan kept out of sight of British officers during that time, for it was not until 1857 that she attracted the attention of Lord Napier. He describes her as a revenue cruiser of the burden of 800 tons, and ventures to suggest to Mr. Cass that it would be expedient for him to inquire whether his government is complying with the treaty of 1817. There is no record of any written reply to Lord Napier's note.

For the next four years the Michigan again seems to have escaped attention. In August, 1861, Lord Lyons wrote to Secretary Seward that he had been instructed to represent to the United States Government that the armament of the Michigan would seem to be in excess of the limit stipulated in the agreement of 1817. Mr. Seward replied, giving the exact tonnage and armament of the Michigan, and stating that she was then, as theretofore, used exclusively for the purpose of recruiting the Navy, with artillery practice for the newly recruited men. He said: "It is not supposed by this Government that their retaining of the steamer in question upon the lakes is a violation of their arrangement of 1817. But if the British Government thinks otherwise, we shall be happy to consider its views in that respect."

Up to the present time the British Government has not accepted this invitation or presented its views. The subject of the armament and tonnage of the Michigan has not occupied the British Ministry for forty years. During that time this vessel has been prudently repaired and has survived in good condition the shot and shell of sixty years of diplomatic correspondence. Even now, in quiet weather, this venerable craft may still be seen proudly but slowly bearing the American flag over the calm waters of the Great Lakes as she goes about her hydrographic task of surveying the scenes of her former triumphs.

We come now to the most interesting and critical period in the life of the Rush-Bagot Convention. During the Civil War the United States found herself involved in a difficulty similar to that which embarrassed Great Britain during the Canadian Revolution of 1838. In 1864, Confederate sympathizers organized on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Canadian soil for the purpose of making depredations on the commerce of the lakes and hostile incursions into the Northern States. To suppress these demonstrations it became necessary to increase our naval force on the lakes. June 18, 1864, the House of Representatives passed a resolution directing that notice should be given to abrogate the Convention of 1817. The Senate did not consider the resolution at that session. In commenting upon the action of the House of Representatives, Lord Lyons wrote to Secretary Seward that Great Britain would view the abrogation of the agreement "with great regret and no little alarm." The United States, however, was not so much concerned about the alarms and regrets of Great Britain as she was about her own self-preservation.

On October 24, 1864, Secretary Seward, acting under instructions from the President, wrote to Charles Francis Adams, our Minister to England, instructing him to give to Earl Russell the six months' notice necessary to terminate the Convention. Mr. Adams gave this notice November 23, 1864.

It will be noted that the Executive Department acted in this matter, without any authority from Congress. It assumed the right to annul the Convention without legislative action. January 17, 1865, Senator Sumner, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported to the Senate, with an amendment, the resolution which had passed the House at its last session. On the next day the resolution passed the Senate. On February 4th the amendment was agreed to by the House, and, on February 9th, the resolution was approved and signed by the President in the following form:

JOINT RESOLUTION to terminate the treaty of eighteen hundred and seventeen, regulating the naval force on the lakes.

Whereas the United States, of the one part, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, of the other part, by a treaty bearing date April, eighteen hundred and seventeen, have regulated the naval force upon the lakes, and it was further provided that "if either party should hereafter be desirous of annulling this stipulation and should give notice to that effect to the other party, it shall cease to be binding after the expiration of six months from the date of such notice;" and whereas the peace of our frontier is now endangered by hostile expeditions against the commerce of the lakes and by other acts of lawless persons, which the naval force of the two countries, allowed by the existing treaty, may be insufficient to prevent; and whereas, further, the President of the United States has proceeded to give the notice required for the termination of the treaty by a com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munication which took effect on the twenty-third of November, eighteen hundred and sixty-four: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the notice given by the President of the United States to the Government of Great Britain and Ireland to terminate the treaty of eighteen hundred and seventeen, regulating the naval force upon the lake, is hereby adopted and ratified as if the same had been authorized by Congress.

Approved, February 9, 1865.

Secretary Seward, Senator Sumner, both Houses of Congress and President Lincoln called this Convention a treaty, so that there is ample justification for giving it that title. As a treaty it was a part of the supreme law of the land. As a law of the land it was repealed by this joint resolution of Congress. Such action certainly would have been a death blow to any other treaty, but the Rush-Bagot Convention still survives. It was resuscitated in this remarkable manner.

As the final triumph of the Federal arms became certain, the attitude of Great Britain towards the United States changed, and the unfriendly manifestations along our northern border ceased. On March 8, 1865, Secretary Seward wrote to Mr. Adams: "You may say to Lord Russell that we are quite willing that the convention should remain practically in force."

No record has been found of any communication to the British authorities by Mr. Adams of his instructions. He may have conveyed them orally at an informal interview, but it is strange that he made no report of his action to his government. The notice given by Mr. Adams, November 23, 1864, would have terminated the agreement May 23, 1865.

June 15, 1865, Sir Frederick Bruce, who had succeeded Lord Lyons as British Minister, wrote to Mr. Hunter, Acting Secretary of State, enquiring whether the agreement of 1817 was virtually at an end, or whether the despatch to Mr. Adams of the 8th of March was intended as a formal withdrawal of the notice of November 23, 1864. Secretary Seward replied in writing to these enquiries the next day that the instruction to the United States Minister at London of March 8, 1865, "was intended as a withdrawal of the previous notice within the time allowed, and that it is so held by this Government." This is probably the only instance where an Act of Congress has been set aside through instructions issued by our Secretary of State to one of our foreign ministers. It is not a legislative precedent that is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

likely to meet with the approval of modern Congresses, although it has been considered effective by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain.

Notwithstanding the passage by Congress of the Joint Resolution of 1865, the Rush-Bagot Convention still exerts its neutralizing influence upon the waters of the Great Lakes, to the manifest satisfaction of the diplomatists of both countries, and with equally manifest injustice to the shipbuilders and naval militia of the lake States. In April, 1890, F. W. Wheeler & Co., shipbuilders of West Bay City, Michigan, were the lowest bidders for the construction of a steel practice vessel for the Naval Academy, of about 800 tons displacement. Their bid was rejected on account of the agreement of 1817, and the contract was awarded to another firm, whose bid was five thousand dollars in excess of that of the Michigan firm. Other similar bids of lake shipbuilders have been rejected by the Navy Department on the same ground. The Department now rejects all bids for the construction of naval vessels on the lakes, even when they are to be taken unarmed to the ocean, or in sections to Atlantic shipyards for completion.

This action on the part of the Government led to the presentation in Congress of numerous petitions for the abrogation or modification of the agreement. On April 11, 1892, the Senate passed a resolution directing the Secretary of State to inform the Senate whether the State Department considered the agreement of 1817 in force, and, if so, what action had been taken to revive it after the passage of the Joint Resolution of 1865. In response to this resolution, President Harrison sent to the Senate, December 7, 1892, a message containing a most interesting and exhaustive account by Mr. John W. Foster, Secretary of State, of the birth, life, death, resuscitation and accomplishments of the Rush-Bagot Convention. In reply to the inquiry whether the Department considered the agreement still in force, he said: "The correspondence exchanged in 1864 shows that it is so regarded." He assumes that Mr. Adams communicated to the British Ministry the instruction of our Secretary of State to withdraw the notice terminating the agreement, and explains that Great Britain could not question Secretary Seward's power to make such a withdrawal. To sustain the Secretary's action was commendable international courtesy, good statesmanship and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sound policy. Whether Secretary Seward's action in committing his Government to the revival of a treaty, the abrogation of which Congress had ratified and approved, was good statesmanship and sound policy may well be questioned.

At the second session of the Fifty-sixth Congress the writer introduced in the House of Representatives a bill authorizing the construction and maintenance of a gunboat on the upper lakes. The object of the bill was to secure a modern vessel for the training of the Naval Militia. Three of the lake States had thoroughly organized companies of Naval Reserves, but most of the members of this force had never seen a modern warship. This bill was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and included as an item in the Naval Appropriation Bill of 1898, with the proviso "that said construction of said gunboat shall conform to all existing treaties and conventions."

On April 16, 1898, immediately upon the passage of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy addressed to the Secretary of State an enquiry whether he would be limited by any restrictions as to armament and tonnage in the construction of a gunboat for the lakes. To this Secretary Day replied, July 1, 1898, that the subject was one of the matters to come before the Joint High Commission on questions affecting the relations between the United States and Canada.

January 15, 1900, the House of Representatives passed a resolution requesting the Secretary of State to communicate to the House the status of this agreement between the United States and Great Britain. February 27, 1900, President McKinley transmitted to the House a message containing a report of Secretary Hay in response to this resolution. Mr. Hay includes in his report the message of President Harrison of December 7, 1892.

From Mr. Hay's report it appears that, on May 30, 1898, the United States and Great Britain agreed upon the creation of a Joint High Commission, to which should be referred for settlement various pending questions between the United States and Canada, among which was "a revision of the agreement of 1817 respecting naval vessels on the lakes." The American Commissioners were instructed to secure a declaration that it was not contrary to the true spirit of the arrangement of 1817 to build war vessels on the lakes to be taken to the ocean, or to maintain gunboats on the lakes for the training of the Naval Reserves.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They were also instructed to arrange with Great Britain for the passage of such vessels through the Canadian canals.

The Secretary's report concludes with these words: "It is understood that some satisfactory progress was made in the Joint High Commission toward the attainment of these ends, but the labors of the Commission have been suspended without reaching a definite result." And so, with the suspension of the labors of the Commission, the construction of the gunboat authorized by Congress three years ago is also suspended, and the Rush-Bagot Convention still survives.

Before passing from this phase of the subject it should be noted that we have for many years maintained on the lakes armed revenue cutters exceeding the tonnage and armament prescribed in the agreement of 1817. In 1857, and again in 1865, Great Britain raised the point that our action in this respect was in violation of the agreement. It certainly is a departure from the views entertained by the framers of the Convention. Our Revenue Cutter Service is under the Treasury Department, and we have replied to the several remonstrances of Great Britain that the revenue cutters were not naval vessels and were used exclusively for enforcing the revenue laws. This explanation has so far sufficed, although our revenue cutters are always available for use by the Navy in time of war. Many of them rendered conspicuous service in the recent conflict with Spain.

III.

It only remains to consider what attitude the United States should assume towards this Convention in the future. The Convention reserves to both parties the right to abrogate the agreement upon giving six months' notice, and, therefore, may be honorably terminated at any time by either of the parties. What is the wisest course for us to pursue? What will be for the best interests of this country? Shall we continue in force the present arrangement and keep up the pretense of complying with the true spirit while persistently violating the plain letter of the agreement? Or shall we seek to secure such modifications of the contract as will make it conform to present conditions and meet the probable requirements of the future? Or shall we abrogate the agreement altogether?

As we have seen, the prime object of the Convention was immediate disarmament. In securing this object it was, and has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

since been, an encouragement to peace and good will. It conferred no power on either party, and it imposed equal restraints on them both. At that time neither party could put gunboats upon the lakes without building them there. This is still true of the United States, unless she obtains the consent of Great Britain to use her canals. Great Britain, on the other hand, can put upon the lakes all of her war vessels that can pass the Canadian locks. In time of peace, therefore, the Convention places a restraint upon the action of Great Britain. This restraint would continue until the commencement of hostilities, or a declaration of war, so that, even if the relations between the two countries should become strained and war should seem imminent, Great Britain could not put a hostile fleet on the lakes until some act of belligerency had taken place.

If, however, this restriction on the power of Great Britain should be removed by the abrogation of the Convention, Great Britain could, at any time, in anticipation of trouble with the United States, place on the lakes a formidable naval force. We could only be prepared for such an emergency by maintaining on the lakes a force sufficient to cope with the fleet which Great Britain could send through the canals.

The locks of the Welland and St. Lawrence canals are 270 feet long, 45 feet wide, and 14 feet deep. Great Britain now has afloat 130 gunboats, 169 torpedo boats, and 108 destroyers, which could pass from the ocean to the lakes. In case of war, therefore, the Convention would seem to be an advantage to the United States. It is devoutly to be hoped that there will never be another war between the United States and Great Britain, either with or without the Rush-Bagot Convention; but it seems unreasonable to suppose that the abrogation of the agreement would make any perceptible difference in the present cordial relations between the two countries. The ties of friendship and commerce are now too strong to be lightly severed, or even strained, without just cause.

What are the disadvantages to the United States of the present arrangement? It should be noted at the outset that they all arise from conditions which did not exist when the Convention was agreed to, and could hardly have been anticipated by its framers.

In the first place, it debars the shipbuilders on the lakes from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

competing for the construction of such government war vessels as can pass the Canadian canals. This is a discrimination against a large and important industry which should not be tolerated except for the most urgent reasons. The American Ship Building Company now has nine plants on the lakes, located at West Superior, Milwaukee, Chicago, Bay City, Detroit, Wyandotte, Buffalo, Cleveland, and Lorraine. There are three other yards on the lakes, at Bay City, Port Huron and Toledo. Owing to their proximity to the coal and iron deposits, all these lake shipyards can compete successfully with any of the yards in this country or elsewhere. They have built several lightships and other vessels for the Treasury Department, and have been, as we have seen, the lowest bidders for some of the naval vessels. The Government is thus a loser as well by being deprived of the competition of these lake yards.

The United States suffers a still more serious loss, which is forcibly alluded to by the Secretary of the Navy in his letter of April 16, 1898:

"This enquiry is prompted by the further consideration that it was doubtless not at all within the contemplation of the understanding of 1817 that the national resources in naval construction should be materially diminished thereby, as they are at present through the exclusion of the facilities afforded by establishments in the lake cities. These establishments might in emergency render important service in the construction of torpedo boats and other small vessels, which, with the concurrence of the British authorities, could be taken through the Welland Canal and placed in commission for sea service as promptly as would be possible if they were built on the Atlantic seaboard."

A strict adherence to the letter of the Convention also excludes the lake yards from the construction of naval vessels for other countries at peace with the United States and Great Britain. It will be seen, therefore, that the United States, by continuing in force this international agreement, deprives twelve private American shipyards of great advantages which are enjoyed by all other yards in the country. What prospect of national gain would now induce the President to make, or the Senate to ratify, a treaty which would shut out from the construction of all naval vessels twelve other private American shipyards on the Atlantic or Pacific coasts?

The Convention of 1817 prevents the efficient training of a large part of our Naval Militia. We now have over five thousand officers and men organized in eighteen States and the Dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trict of Columbia. Of this number eleven hundred are in Illinois, Michigan and Ohio. It is a disadvantage to the Government and an injustice and discouragement to these Naval Reserves to be deprived of the same practice on a modern gunboat that is enjoyed by the reserves in the seaboard States. There is a delicious humor, bordering on comic opera, in the position of our Government that it is wholly in harmony with the spirit of the Convention to maintain the Michigan on the lakes, but that it would shock the spirit of the agreement to replace that naval antiquity with a modern boat of the same tonnage and armament. If Great Britain should now propose to place upon the lakes a rival to our marine curiosity, we certainly could not object. But should we then make the farce complete by suggesting to Great Britain that she might maintain a vessel of the same tonnage and armament as the Michigan, but that her vessel must also follow the design and construction of the Michigan, and be furnished with the same archaic appliances? We should either have to adopt this course, or else assume the scarcely less ludicrous position of permitting Great Britain to maintain a modern gunboat on the lakes, while confining ourselves to the model of 1841. It is difficult for the ordinary mind to understand why replacing the Michigan by a modern boat would give the spirit of the Rush-Bagot Convention a greater shock than it received when the Michigan succeeded the wooden sailing vessels of the early forties.

In concluding this enumeration of the disadvantages to the United States of adhering to the agreement of 1817, attention must be drawn to the position in which the United States would now be placed in case of a war with Great Britain, although I do not take much account of the possibilities of war between the two countries. War ends all treaties between the belligerents. In anticipation of hostilities, Great Britain could concentrate on the upper St. Lawrence a powerful naval force ready for operation on the lakes upon the declaration of war. Our most efficient method of opposing this force would be by land batteries commanding the upper St. Lawrence and the waters connecting the lakes. With or without this Convention we shall always be at a disadvantage in a conflict with Great Britain on the lakes until we have constructed a waterway through our own territory from the ocean to the lakes of sufficient size to admit the passage of vessels as large as those which can pass through the Canadian canals.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A careful study of the history of the Rush-Bagot Convention, and an impartial estimate of the advantages and disadvantages accruing to the United States from an adherence to its terms, as now interpreted, lead to the conclusion that the loss to the United States outweighs the gain; that it is to the interest of both parties to make a new arrangement respecting naval armaments on the lakes; that the agreement of 1817 is obsolete, and not fit for the foundation of an international understanding; that a treaty should be made between the United States and Great Britain which would expressly annul the Rush-Bagot Convention and settle the questions of armament and naval construction on the lakes in conformity with modern conditions.

As the Joint High Commission is in a state of suspended animation, with little prospect of recovery, may we not hope that our present Secretary of State and the present distinguished Ambassador from Great Britain will soon be able personally to adjust the differences between the two countries, and link their names to a treaty which, while impartially protecting the rights of both, will, as a pledge of permanent peace, rival the famous Rush-Bagot Convention.

HENRY SHERMAN BOUTELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RUSSIA AND POPULAR EDUCATION.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY, CONSTANTIN POBIEDONOSTSEFF, PROCURATOR OF THE HOLY SYNOD OF RUSSIA.

(A reply to Prince Kropotkin.)

THE editor of this REVIEW has invited me to write an article on the present situation of Russia. That is a task, however, to which I do not feel myself equal. It is not only beyond the strength of an old man, whose strength is worn out, but it is even beyond the unaided strength of any individual scholar or journalist in Russia. It is not difficult to write a political pamphlet on such a subject, and pamphlets of the kind come frequently enough from the press of both hemispheres. The writings that issue from Congresses in which Russia is the theme are in general nothing more than political pamphlets inspired by doctrinal prejudices and the hatreds of pedants and party men. To this category belong the pamphlets of Kropotkin, a professional apostle of anarchy and socialism. Though a Russian, he does not know Russia, and is incapable of understanding his country; for the soul of the Russian people is a closed book to him which he has never opened. His impressions of the present state of Russia are based only on gossip and the tales invented by daily newspapers and their equally ignorant and incapable correspondents, as far as seeking the truth about men and facts is concerned.

I limit myself, therefore, to correcting some of the material errors that abound in Kropotkin's recent article in this periodical, which treats principally of the Russian system of administering the Universities and Schools. It is true that historically considered this system reveals a whole series of mistakes and wrong measures for which the Government is responsible. What Government is free from defects of this sort? Yet one thing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that should not be forgotten is that Russia is a "world" apart, and that her civilization has not passed through the discipline of several centuries of culture as has that of Western countries. It is, therefore, impossible to judge her according to the criterion yielded by another race, another history, another culture, itself trained and ripened through a long past, even without emphasizing the fact that this criterion is not an altogether fixed and definite standard in countries possessing this ancient culture. Another thing that should not be forgotten is that the password "liberty" is not a talisman capable of opening all secrets and solving all the questions of human existence. Kropotkin comments severely upon the meagreness of the amounts granted to Elementary Schools and the inadequacy of the schools themselves. He says:

"While even now we have in European Russia only one school for each 2,230 inhabitants, and while only one child out of every twenty or thirty children of school age goes to school (as against seven in England), the Ministry of Public Instruction, for years in succession under Alexander II., returned every year to the State Exchequer one-half of the poor allowance of $4,000,000 a year for the primary schools, which was inscribed in the budget. It found no use for the money! And if the Ministry of Public Instruction spends now its budget allowance in full, it is because it has hit upon the following plan: It does not open schools of its own, but spends the money in *subsidies to the village clergy, who, leaving aside their general ignorance*, keep schools mostly on paper only. Their time being fully taken up by their regular duties (marriages, burials, etc.), they generally pay quite ignorant cantors, or retired soldiers, to attend to the schools. And all this is perfectly well known in Russia."

This accusation is based on a complete ignorance of the facts. Since Kropotkin left Russia the progress in this matter has been enormous and the correspondents on whose information he relies are, probably, as ignorant as himself. He has no knowledge of the village-clergy schools. The Elementary Schools are: (1.) those established by the Minister for Education; (2.) those established and maintained by the Zemstvos; (3.) those which are attached to the ecclesiastical parishes. The schools of this last class either did not exist at all in Kropotkin's time, or, if they existed, they were completely neglected; whereas, under the reign of Alexander III., they were placed on a new footing and grew rapidly. In spite of all Kropotkin may say from his biased point of view, the schools of this third class are the most serviceable to Russia. As a learned geographer and sociologist Kropotkin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ought to know that throughout the vast domains of the Empire the population is scattered in the most diverse manner. There are no roads, and the people live on the steppes, in the woods, in the marshes; their dwellings are sometimes separated by five to eight hundred versts of uncultivated and impassable country; and the inhabitants themselves, without culture, here and there even barbarous, gain a scanty living far from all means of communication and the necessaries for industry and commerce. Is it possible for human power to supply all these spots and out-of-the-way places with regular schools and masters? And yet they contain human souls and Russian subjects. Happily, even in the least cultivated regions, churches are to be found; and it is these churches of our country which, existing everywhere, sow the seeds of civilization among the poor who inhabit these wastes that are veritable centres of light in darkness. It must be remembered that with such a state of things the main question in these regions is not that of beginning at once to instruct in the sciences, but that of inculcating in the people's minds notions of what is right and wrong, just and unjust, true and false; of teaching them the alphabet, teaching them writing, teaching them the principles of the Gospel, and of bringing their minds to the realization of spiritual truth. The school, therefore, must be simple and cheap, in accordance with the nature of the locality. Such is the principle of the parish school in Russia; yet, in proportion as the local conditions are more favorable, the school in many places develops these primitive rudiments into a more varied instruction and furnishes a complete course of elementary education. The progress made by these schools is much to their credit, and the State, recognizing this, makes them at present considerable grants (as much even as six million roubles), while, on the other hand, a similar sum, or more, is supplied by voluntary contributions. What Kropotkin says about the incapacity of the Village Clergy is certainly unjust. Perhaps in his time the ignorant schoolmasters of whom he speaks, often recruited from pensioned soldiers, were only too common. To-day we have a regular system of seminaries and training-colleges for the education of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, who are all the more necessary as the parish priest, engaged in his professional duties, cannot efficiently carry out school teaching. When Kropotkin alleges that the schools of the Caucasus and the Don Cossacks are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much more advanced than the ordinary Russian schools, he again betrays his ignorance of the facts, the condition of the schools in these regions being, on the contrary, much inferior.

Kropotkin proceeds: "The study of comparative state law was prohibited." This, perhaps, may have occurred a few times when prohibition, so to speak, had gone mad; but the madness was of very short duration, and the study in question is, on the contrary, widely pursued in the universities.

Kropotkin leads us once more into the midst of fable and gossip when he says:

> M. Bogolépoff, in his younger days, was more or less of a Liberal; but, since he has obtained his nomination as Minister of Public Instruction, he has been a mere tool in the hands of the Procurator of the Holy Synod, Pobiedonostseff, a narrow-minded fanatic of the State religion, who—if it were only in his power—would have burned at the stake all protestants against Orthodoxy and Catholicism."

(1.) I had nothing to do with the business of the Educational Department. It was Bogolépoff who was entrusted with it; and when he says, "These two men, Bogolépoff and Pobiedonostseff, reported the Kieff affair to the Czar," he asserts what is untrue. I was totally ignorant of this Kieff affair, which concerned two ministers only, Bogolépoff and the Minister for the Interior. (2.) Until his appointment, Bogolépoff was quite unknown to me, and afterwards we remained as strangers to each other. Indeed, he was, if anything, hostile and opposed to me, and never once consulted me.

Kropotkin further says:

> "When the Kieff disorders were reported to Nicholas II., he said, first, that he had had enough of these students' riots and would close all the universities."

This is false from beginning to end. Who heard what the Czar said? Kropotkin's correspondents did not. They simply invented, as they invent every day for the press. What a series of platitudes! "He spoke *next* of Port Arthur, and *finally* issued an order for military service." In order to get at the true significance of *next* and *finally*, it should be remembered that our Emperor never issues such orders on his personal responsibility. He contents himself with confirming the decisions of the various executive councils and the resolutions of his ministers in cases prescribed by the law.

The decree concerning the military service of students guilty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of creating an agitation against the university curriculum was published independently of any initiative on the part of the Emperor. The ministers, in a Cabinet meeting that had been called in consequence of these university disorders, deemed it necessary to have recourse to this punishment, and their resolution was submitted for the Emperor's approval. A regulation was published, according to which the application of the penalty in each case was made to depend on a special committee comprising the ministers whose departments were concerned, and the decisions of this committee were to be valid in law without needing an imperial sanction. The Kieff affair, therefore, was settled in this way, and the will of the Emperor had no share in it. When Kropotkin affirms that "these students were carried away as criminals in absolute secrecy, to some unknown destination presumed to be Port Arthur," he says what is quite imaginary. Nothing of the kind took place; and, without any secrecy, the students were quietly sent off by rail to their respective regiments, the Minister for War being present at their departure and arranging for the comfort of their journey. What is unfortunately true is, that the measure in question was applied at once to one hundred and eighty students, which gave it a peculiarly rigorous character; whereas the law was meant to apply only to a few exceptional cases.

Kropotkin's article furnishes another striking example of the monstrous lies spread abroad by the press concerning the internal condition of Russia, as also of Kropotkin's complete ignorance of the country to which he formerly belonged. He has not hesitated to give currency to the following absurd story, which he has picked up somewhere and which I quote in his own words:

> "Finally, the Committee of the Ministers, assuming for the *first time* the rôle of a ministry, discussed the Imperial order and insisted upon its withdrawal. It refused to acquiesce in the will of the Czar to proclaim a state of siege, and it obtained the dismissal of the St. Petersburg Chief of Police, General Kleigels."

Now, no such thing did take place or could take place, for anything of the kind would have been contrary to all law; and, as a matter of fact, rightly or wrongly, General Kleigels has *never ceased* occupying his functions as Chief of Police.

Lastly, Kropotkin has no other panacea to propose for the happiness and welfare of Russia than the ever-recurring nostrum

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of professional politicians, "the Constitution," "the Chamber of Representatives," and "the power of the governing majority." Being an anarchist he chooses what in reality would be the surest means of bringing about anarchy in the country which he has abjured. He says that, to speak plainly, Russia has outgrown the autocratic form of government. But, even if we were to admit the truth of this, God forbid we should seek for the amelioration of this form of government in the remedy proposed by Kropotkin. If it were attempted, all Russia would rise against this worst of all tyrannies, *tyranny in the mass*. He ought to know that to-day almost everywhere in Europe we may say the various States have outgrown the *representative form* of government, and that everywhere serious minds are protesting against the tyranny of parliamentary majorities at once incapable and turbulent. There is plenty of solid literature on the subject; for example, in America, Godkin's book on "The Unforeseen Tendencies of Democracy." France, Austria, Germany, Italy all feel themselves powerless to make headway with their badly-working representation and their present parliamentary machinery. One may safely assert that this question is one of the most important in political science, a fatal problem of the Sphinx placed for solution between the nineteenth and twentieth century. Yet, Kropotkin persists at such a time in maintaining doctrines already worn out, which were the creed of pedants in the first half of the nineteenth century.

C. POBIEDONOSTSEFF.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PUBLIC DEBT OF GREAT BRITAIN.

BY HAROLD COX.

THE public debt of the United Kingdom consists of two quite distinct portions, the National Debt and the Local Debt. The former has been incurred by the nation as a whole and is a charge upon the national, or, in the more common phrase, the "imperial," revenue. The latter represents the separate borrowings of many hundreds of different local authorities, and for this debt the Imperial Government has only a remote responsibility. Each locality must bear the burden of its own local debt, and the Imperial Government would be very chary of offering assistance even in the case of threatened bankruptcy. Of the two burdens, the National Debt is by far the larger, but till recently was being rapidly diminished. The Local Debt, on the other hand, though it is at present just under one-half of the National Debt, is growing at a rate which alarms many observers. There is, however, this very important and consoling feature about the growth of local indebtedness in the United Kingdom, that practically the whole of the money borrowed has been spent on public works of a useful and, in most cases, of a durable character. In return for the £300,000,000 borrowed by local authorities in Great Britain and Ireland, the nation possesses a splendid property, in the shape of municipal water works, sewer works, gas works, harbors, capacious and often handsome school buildings, municipal offices, public libraries, museums, picture galleries, parks and pleasure grounds. It possesses also, although in this case the pride of possession is somewhat diluted, a large number of gigantic asylums for the insane, and a larger number of solid, if unattractive, buildings miscalled "workhouses," which might more accurately be described as resthouses for the reception of the destitute poor. All this the local authorities can show for their debt. The National Debt, on the other hand,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been incurred mainly in order to meet expenditure upon war, and there now remains nothing to show for it—except the British Empire.

It is convenient, as well as obvious, to deal first with the National Debt. In its present form, that debt has a continuous history of over two hundred years. Its beginning can be traced to a breach of faith by Charles II. Before that event, English monarchs were undoubtedly familiar with the practice of borrowing, but they only borrowed for short terms, generally a few months or perhaps a year, and they always paid back. The history of these earlier borrowings is so full of interest that it may be worth while to dwell for a few moments upon the subject.*

In essence, these borrowings by the earlier kings of England were only anticipations of current revenue; the very form in which the loan was contracted is incidental evidence of that fact. From the time of the Norman Conquest, it was the practice of the Exchequer to acknowledge the receipt of revenue by means of a wooden tally. A tally (French, *taillé*) is a stick cleft down the middle and cut across the cleavage with a series of notches. One half or side of the cleft stick is handed over to the payer of the money, and the other is retained by the receiver. The system forms a perfect check on receipts; for, in case of dispute, all that is needed is to bring the two halves of the stick together and see that the notches coincide. The present writer saw such tallies in daily use, a few years ago, in a baker's shop in the capital of Normandy. As evidence of their recent use by unlettered people in England, it may be mentioned that, in Kentish hop gardens, the man who keeps the books and checks the earnings of each picker is still called the "tally man." The official use of tallies in the English Exchequer continued down to 1824. Ten years later, a care-taker in the buildings where these now useless bits of wood were stored, was instructed to get rid of them by burning them in ordinary fire-grates. He heaped on too many at once, and the Houses of Parliament were burnt to the ground.

All this about tallies is to lead up to the point, that the early

*A mass of interesting and most valuable information on this subject will be found in Parliamentary papers 443, of 1858, and 366, of 1869. Detailed information with regard to the early history of the funded debt, will be found clearly arranged in tabular form in paper C. 9010 (1898), and similar information with regard to the later history of the debt will be found in paper C. 6539 (1891). The latest official information with regard to the existing debt, is contained in paper Cd. 350, of 1900, and in the Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom, paper 241, of 1900.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form of royal or government borrowing in England was by "tallies of loan." An Exchequer tally, as already seen, was properly an acknowledgment of money paid into the Exchequer on account of revenue; and so, by a natural extension, when money was advanced to the king, to help him to carry on until the revenue came in, the lender received a "tally of loan," which was an acknowledgment of the money lent. A further development took place somewhat later. At periods when no one was willing to lend money, and when the treasury was empty, the difficulty was surmounted by paying the creditors of the Crown with "tallies of anticipation" instead of cash. Tallies of this class were really equivalent to bills drawn upon the Exchequer in anticipation of revenue, and were presented for payment as soon as the revenue came in. Such tallies were entered in the Exchequer-books, as if their equivalent in money had actually been lent to the Exchequer by the man who had accepted the tally, and they were, therefore, often described as "tallies of fictitious loan." To modern ears it will sound strange to add that money advanced on tallies of loan originally bore no interest, and that in the same way tallies of anticipation were accepted without discount. There is, for example, an interesting record, in the Exchequer Rolls of the fourteenth century, of the repayment to Elizabeth de Vaux, on June 5th, 1353, of the exact sum of ten marks, which she had advanced, upon tally of loan, on November 14th, 1352. This absence of interest was due rather to religious than to fiscal considerations. Throughout the Middle Ages the Christian Church condemned the taking of interest upon money as immoral, as the Mohammedan Church does to this day; and it was not until late in the seventeenth century that interest began to be paid upon loans to the government. Yet loans were frequent, and often on less reliable security than that of an exchequer tally. Thus, the famous Dick Whittington, thrice Lord Mayor of London, lent Henry V. large sums of money on a mere verbal promise to pay. Other municipal magnates were less confiding; for the same King had to pledge his "great collar garnished with rubies and sapphires and pearls," before he could get a loan of £500 out of the Mayor and Corporation of Coventry. His son redeemed the pledge.

In all these cases, the money was borrowed by the King himself on the security of his hereditary revenues, or on such per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonal pledge as he could offer. But, in the sixteenth century, Parliament began cautiously to recognize its responsibility for these temporary loans, provided that the money had been spent in the public service. With that recognition, the idea of national, as distinct from royal, indebtedness begins; but still another hundred years elapsed before any permanent debt was contracted.

The first case of interest being paid on public loans was in the year of the Restoration of Charles II. (1660), when an Act of Parliament was passed declaring that: "Any person lending £100 or a greater summe shall doe very good and acceptable service and shall receive interest at 6 per cent."

Four years later, Parliament took another leap forward in the art of borrowing, by providing that the warrants for the payment of principal should be assignable, and consequently negotiable. This was not merely an advantage to the Government, by enabling it to borrow with greater ease, but it was also a very great public convenience. In order to extend this convenience, an Act was passed three years later (1667) making all treasury warrants assignable. Every creditor of the Crown was thus able to get from a banker, or other moneyed man, immediate cash in exchange for any tally of anticipation, or other warrant for payment, which he had in his possession. The moneyed men to whom most resort was made for this purpose were the goldsmiths of Lombard street. The system worked admirably for some five years; till Charles, in 1672, by royal proclamation, suddenly suspended payment for one year on all assigned warrants, offering his creditors, instead, interest at six per cent. The sum involved was £1,328,526; and it is needless to say that the suspension of payment of such a relatively large sum entailed the bankruptcy of numbers of previously prosperous houses. The suspension was renewed year by year; but, for twelve years, the King had at least the honesty to pay the promised interest with punctuality. Then that, too, was stopped. In the vain hope of redress, the unfortunate goldsmiths appealed to the courts. It took them fourteen years to get a final judgment in their favor; and then Parliament at once intervened (1699) to compel a compromise which was practically a confiscation. Nothing was allowed for fifteen years' arrears of interest, and the original principal and interest were both halved. The net result was that the goldsmiths, or their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

representatives, who were legally entitled to about £4,000,000, received instead a perpetual annuity of £39,855, which the Crown could at any time cancel by the payment of the capital sum of £664,263. That capital sum, if we look to its origin, may fairly be described as the oldest item in the existing debt of the United Kingdom.

But, while Parliament was haggling over this item, other debts had been incurred. When the last of the Stuarts fled the country, in 1688, he left behind him a floating debt of £84,000, secured on tallies of loan. William III. borrowed far larger sums, on similar security, to meet the heavy expenditure of his Continental wars, and he also issued large quantities of tallies of anticipation or fictitious loan. In a very short time, it was found that the revenue was insufficient to meet these bills drawn upon it. Tallies fell to a heavy discount, and it became necessary to invent some new method of borrowing.

It was under these circumstances that, in 1693, the first "tontine" was tried. Without going into details, it is sufficient to say that, in principle, a tontine is a system of life annuities, so arranged that, as each annuitant dies, his share is divided among the surviving annuitants, the last survivor securing the whole. There were, however, in all the tontines that were tried numberless complications of age categories, and the like, that were intended to attract, but only confused, the public. Probably it was on this account that the tontine system never took root in England; though, curiously enough, English capitalists subscribed freely to the tontines launched in Ireland. The tontine of 1693, that should have brought in £1,000,000, only realized £108,000. The balance was raised by means of simple life annuities.

In the next year, 1694, the continued necessities of William of Orange compelled another new departure; and, for the first time in our history, a permanent loan was sanctioned by Parliament. The sum of £1,200,000 was borrowed by the Government from the subscribers to the capital of the newly founded Bank of England, who received in return a Charter of Incorporation and a perpetual annuity of £100,000 a year—£96,000 for interest on the loan at eight per cent., and £4,000 for the expenses of management. Four years later (1698), another great corporation, the New East India Company, came to the assistance of the Government, and lent £2,000,000, also as a permanent loan. A third

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

permanent loan was contracted, as explained in detail above, in order to meet the debt incurred by Charles II. to the goldsmiths of Lombard street.

Stress is laid on these three items, because they are the beginnings of the permanent debt. The essence of that debt is that the State is under no obligation to repay the principal sums borrowed. All that the State has agreed to do is to go on paying interest forever, or until such time as the principal may be repaid. On the other hand, in the case of such loans as were raised in early times on tallies of loan, and are raised in modern times by Treasury Bills, the State undertakes to repay the principal at a fixed date. The one form of loan may involve a burden on countless, unborn generations; the other is a transaction begun and ended within a few months. It has long been the custom in England to call the debt created by loans of the former class the "funded debt," because the interest is a permanent charge upon the taxes or funds of the State. In contradistinction, the word "unfunded" is used to describe the debt which consists of temporary loans or floating obligations. The process of converting temporary into permanent debt is known as "funding." Intermediate in character, and also in historical sequence, between these two classes of debt, are the loans secured on terminable annuities. In the case of a terminable annuity, the State undertakes to repay the capital, together with interest, in a series of annual instalments, usually spread over a considerable period.

To sum up in a sentence what has already been written:—We have seen that the practice of short loans or unfunded borrowings began far back in the thirteenth or fourteenth century; that terminable annuities had their origin, so far as England is concerned, in the First Tontine and the other life annuities of 1692; and that the funded debt began in 1694 with a loan of £1,200,000 from the Bank of England, followed by another loan from the New East India Company, and by the "funding" of the Goldsmiths' debt.

All these methods of borrowing have continued in use down to the present time; and interchanges between the different classes of debt have frequently been made, either to tempt the public or to suit the convenience of the Government. One of the most remarkable of these interchanges was the great funding transaction accomplished, with the aid of the South Sea Company, in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

early years of the eighteenth century. That Company was established in 1711, for the nominal purpose of trading in the South Seas. It actually did supply negroes for some years to the Spanish colonies; but its main business consisted in taking over large floating debts of the British Government and converting them into a capital stock. The Company, in fact, acted as middleman between the Government and its creditors. The original sum taken over in 1711 was £9,177,967, made up of all kinds of debts —including tradesmen's bills, arrears of wages to seamen, and a subsidy due to the Elector at Hanover. Arrears of interest and a cash advance to the Government soon brought this sum up to £10,000,000; and, a few years later, the Company further relieved the Government of a large number of terminable annuities and made an additional cash advance. So far, the transactions were straightforward and satisfactory to both parties. But in 1720 the company attempted a great *coup*—and failed. It offered to take over all the outstanding terminable annuities and many of the permanent annuities—valued together at over £26,-000,000—and to convert them into a new stock. Capital at the time was plentiful in the country, and, as soon as the South Sea Company made this proposal, the Bank of England stepped in and offered to pay a handsome bonus to the Government for the privilege of being allowed to conduct the conversion. The two institutions bid against one another, until the South Sea Company ended by agreeing to pay to the Government, as a bonus, the impossible sum of £7,000,000. But the mere magnitude of the transaction had impressed the public mind, and the stock issued by the Company rose to a premium of 1,000 per cent. After a few months, the inevitable crash came, and the people who had been ruined appealed to Parliament for relief. As the Government had been largely responsible for the catastrophe, prompt relief was given. The directors of the company and other persons who had made fraudulent profits—including the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself—were compelled to disgorge, and at the same time the Government abandoned its claim to the promised £7,000,000. The conversion scheme, however, held good; and, when the accounts had been straightened out, the capital of the Company stood at £33,800,000, secured as a Government debt. In other words, this figure represented the net amount of Government debt converted or funded through the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

medium of the South Sea Company during the period from 1711 to 1720. The South Sea debt—gradually reduced from time to time—remained a separate item in the national accounts until 1854, when Mr. Gladstone paid off the remnant of it, either in cash or consols.

The transactions between the Government and the Bank of England have been of a much more sober character. From time to time, the Bank has advanced large sums to the Government, and it has also rendered very important service by assisting in the issue of loans, and by undertaking the management of the debt, or portions of it. Exactly similar services have been rendered by the Bank of Ireland; and, at the present time, the management of the whole of the debt is divided between these two corporations. By far the larger amount is, of course, in the hands of the Bank of England. The payment for management is calculated at so much per million pounds of stock, and in the financial year ending March 31st, 1900, it amounted to £174,864. It is interesting to note that, in the same year, the Bank of England paid back to the Government about a thousand pounds more than this sum as part payment for the privilege of issuing bank notes.

Having now described, with some detail, the methods by which money was borrowed in the earlier years of the debt, it will be convenient to show, in round figures, how the debt was piled up by successive wars. The almost continuous war waged by William of Orange, as champion of Protestant Europe against Catholic Europe, cost England an addition of about £12,000,000 to her debt, besides expenditure out of revenue. The long war of the Spanish Succession, under Queen Anne, cost another £20,000,000 of debt. Wars with Spain, under George I. and George II., added £35,000,000 more. The Seven Years' War, 1756 to 1763, involved an addition of no less than £58,000,000 to the debt; and another £88,000,000 was added by the American War of Independence. But even these huge figures are small beside the enormous load of debt occasioned by the prolonged war with France in the closing years of the eighteenth century. At the end of that gigantic war, the last great struggle between England and France, the united debts of Great Britain and Ireland stood at the enormous figure of £902,000,000, involving an annual charge of £32,645,000.

That is the high water mark of the British National Debt. From 1815 down to the time when the heavy expenditures upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the South African War began, there was a fairly steady reduction —the only important exceptions being, first, in the years 1836 and 1837, when £20,000,000 were borrowed to compensate the owners of slaves in British colonies, and, secondly, in the years 1855 and 1856, when the debt was increased by £35,000,000 on account of the Crimean War. At the close of the Crimean War the debt stood at £842,000,000, involving an annual charge of £25,942,000 for interest and management. By the year 1900 the capital had been reduced to £639,000,000 and the corresponding annual charge to £17,600,000. A year later, in consequence of the South African War, the capital had risen to £703,000,000.

Before giving the details of these figures, it is worth while to say a word about the methods by which the debt, so rapidly piled up in time of war, has been slowly reduced in time of peace. During the whole of the eighteenth century, the burden of the debt was very seriously felt, owing to the comparative poverty of the country; and, in the vain hope of securing an automatic reduction, Parliament created, as early as 1716, the first Sinking Fund. The principle of this sinking fund, known as Sir Robert Walpole's, was sound enough. Certain taxes were set aside for the service of the debt, and, after interest had been defrayed, the surplus was to be used for reducing the capital. The system, however, broke down, because, almost as soon as the sinking fund had been established with a comfortable margin for the reduction of debt, Parliament proceeded to create fresh debt on the security of that margin, and after a few years altogether ignored the purpose of the sinking fund and charged ordinary expenditure upon it. It was in consequence of this failure of Walpole's sinking fund that, in 1786, Pitt proposed a more elaborate system. On the theory that Parliament could not be trusted to reduce the debt of its own free action, a special body of commissioners was created and rendered independent of the annual money votes of the House of Commons. By a permanent statute, this body, known as the Commission for the Reduction of the National Debt, was endowed with an income of £1,000,000 a year—subsequently increased to £1,400,000 —chargeable upon the public revenue. The duty of the Commissioners was to apply the whole of this sum to the purchase of Government Stock, and to invest the dividends in the purchase of more stock. It was calculated that, in this way, by the magic of compound interest, the whole of the debt would, in a compara-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tively short time, pass into the hands of the Commissioners, when it could be cancelled.

It is almost superfluous to point out that the operation would have been a good deal simpler and more economical if each portion of the debt had been cancelled as soon as it was purchased by the Commissioners. But a far more serious defect lay in the fact that the system was only workable at a profit in times of peace and financial prosperity. So long as the Government was obliged to borrow with one hand, it was worse than useless to continue paying off debt with the other. The mere complication of accounts would mean some unnecessary expense, and, in addition, a heavy waste would result because the margin between the price at which new loans could be raised, and the price at which old loans could be cleared off, would be almost invariably against the Government. As one of the later critics of Pitt's Sinking Fund said, it compelled the Government to "sell new stock cheap in order to buy old stock dear." Yet this apparently obvious defect was so far from impressing the original supporters of Pitt's Sinking Fund that Parliament actually provided that, whenever a loan was raised for any purpose, one per cent. of the sum borrowed should be added to the Sinking Fund. In other words, the nation had to borrow £100 when £99 would have sufficed. It is a curious example of the simple folly that often guides the affairs of great nations, that Pitt's Sinking Fund, with slight modifications, lasted for forty-three years. In that interval, new debt to the amount of about £330,000,000 was created for the sole purpose of cancelling old debt. This futile operation is estimated to have involved a net loss to the country of over £40,000,000.

In 1828, a committee of the House of Commons categorically declared its faith in the elementary principle that no real reduction of debt is possible unless the revenue of the country exceeds the expenditure, and in 1829 statutory effect was given to the consequences of this axiom. The National Debt Commissioners were continued in existence; but, instead of a fixed income, they were only to receive the actual surplus of income over expenditure. The whole of this surplus, whatever it might be, was to be paid over to the Commissioners, and was to be devoted by them to the purchase of stock; and, as soon as each purchase was completed, the stock was to be cancelled. These provisions, with some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

small differences of detail, are still in force, and the annual operation which they provide for is now known as "The Old Sinking Fund."

The expressed intention of Parliament in 1829 was that a regular surplus of about £3,000,000 a year should be maintained; but in practice this was not done. The country was more eager for the reduction of taxation than for the reduction of debt; and in the years immediately following the establishment of the Old Sinking Fund, the realized surplus was often even less than £1,000,000. Therefore, if this fund alone had been relied upon, the reduction of the debt would have been very small. Two devices have, however, been adopted during the present reign, for cheating Parliament into reducing the debt unconsciously.

The first of these is the conversion of perpetual into terminable annuities. As we have already seen, the practice of borrowing money on the security of terminable annuities, whether for life or for a fixed period, is almost contemporaneous with the establishment of the funded debt. The practice was continued throughout the eighteenth century, and sometimes was worked in combination with the creation of capital debt, subscribers to a permanent stock receiving, by way of bonus, a small terminable annuity, in addition to the guaranteed interest. In 1808, the further experiment was tried of asking the creditors of the Government to accept life annuities in exchange for stock. The experiment failed, because the tables of mortality had been badly calculated; but the practice was renewed at a later period on a sounder basis. Life annuities, based on reliable calculations, are now sold to the public through the agency of the Post Office, and the money received is handed over to the National Debt Commissioners for the purchase and cancelling of Government stock. Up to the year 1890, when the last Report was issued, stock to the amount of £55,000,000 had thus been cancelled in exchange for life annuities and, though annuitants are proverbially long lived, the State may already regard that amount of debt as practically wiped off.

The use of annuities for fixed periods, as a means of paying off debt, has had a somewhat similar history. In 1819, the public was first invited to convert its permanent stock into annuities for a limited period; but these annuities do not seem to have greatly attracted investors, and up to 1890 the stock cancelled on account

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of fixed period annuities sold to the public was only about £20,000,000.

It was partly in consequence of the failure of the public to patronize this system that Mr. Gladstone, in 1863, introduced the artifice of compelling Government Departments to convert their stock into terminable annuities. Two Government Departments, the Post Office Savings Bank and the Court of Chancery, are large holders of Government Stock, which they have purchased on account of depositors or of suitors. Large lumps of this stock were cancelled by Mr. Gladstone, and the Departments received, in exchange, annuities for a term of years. The process has since been repeated several times. But the transaction is purely a paper one. The Government Departments in question do not want terminable annuities; they want a permanent stock; and, therefore, they are obliged each year to set aside, out of their terminable annuities, a sufficient sum to buy from the public enough stock to ultimately replace the stock cancelled. These annual purchases from the public represent the only real reduction of the debt, and it would obviously be simpler for the Government to leave the Savings Bank and the Court of Chancery alone, and buy the stock direct from the public and cancel it. The sole argument for the present elaborate procedure lies in the theory that Parliament is cozened into an unconscious reduction of the debt. The annuities granted to the Departments appear as a charge in the accounts which has to be met; whereas the setting aside of so much money each year for the frank reduction of debt might give rise to complaints.

But, if the average Member of Parliament is too foolish to see through such a transparent device, Chancellors of the Exchequer are not. Mr. Gladstone's scheme has gone the way of all other schemes for reducing the debt by means of a trick. These annuities, supposed to be sacred, have been treated by Mr. Gladstone's successors, and even by himself, with only lip reverence. If a Chancellor of the Exchequer has wanted money, he has not scrupled to convert these departmental annuities into annuities involving a reduced annual charge, and therefore running for a longer period; while, at the same time, he has always expressed in eloquent language his deep sense of the duty of paying off the debt as rapidly as possible. At the present time, it is doubtful whether anybody is deceived by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these departmental or paper annuities. The official accounts now frankly state how much of the total annuities represents expenditure on capital account, and how much stands for interest and management; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer takes as much credit to himself for the reduction annually effected by the annuities as he does for direct cancelling of debt. Whatever small advantage may possibly have resulted in the past from these paper transactions, it is safe to say that, at present, they are only of value to the clerks who are paid for working out the elaborate calculations involved.

A more effective method of compelling Parliament to make regular provision for the reduction of the debt was initiated by Sir Stafford Northcote in 1875. In view of the steadily increasing wealth of the country, Sir Stafford Northcote urged that Parliament could afford to spend at least as much every year on the service of the debt as was spent when the nation was considerably poorer. He pointed out that, up to 1860, the annual charge for the debt had not fallen below £28,000,000; and he proposed to go back to that figure and to make it a fixed annual charge. Out of this sum the interest and cost of management of the capital debt, and the charges for terminable annuities, were first to be defrayed; and the balance remaining over—known as the "New Sinking Fund"—was to be expended in buying up and cancelling debt. Under this scheme, it is clear that the debt would be reduced at a constantly accelerated rate; for, as stock was purchased and cancelled, the interest upon it would cease, and more money would be available for the purchase of more stock. To further guard the scheme, it was provided that, in the case of fresh borrowings of a temporary character, the fixed annual charge was to be increased to meet the extra debt, and this provision has been honorably adhered to. At the same time, the Old Sinking Fund was maintained, so that, in addition to whatever might be available out of the £28,000,000, any surplus of general income over expenditure would still go to reduce the debt.

On the whole, Sir Stafford Northcote's scheme has worked better than any other method tried for the reduction of the debt. Unfortunately, his successors have not all possessed his high ideal of the nation's duty to its posterity. In 1888, the permanent fixed charge was reduced to £26,000,000, and in 1890 to £25,000,000. By the budget of 1899, it was further reduced to £23,000,000,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in the war budgets of 1900 and 1901 every variety of sinking fund went by the board.

Incidentally, recent events have shown that there is still considerable vagueness in the minds of official financiers with regard to the true character of a sinking fund. The present Chancellor of the Exchequer, in October, 1899, formally announced that on no account would he consent to suspend the sinking fund in order to meet the expenses of the South African war, which he then estimated at about £10,000,000. That determination—which only lasted to the following March—was as unjustifiable as was his reduction of the sinking fund in his peace budget in the spring of 1899. A sinking fund is essentially a peace-fund, a yearly expenditure in time of peace as an insurance against the cost of war. To continue this expenditure in time of war is to repeat the colossal blunder of Pitt's sinking fund. Not only is the suspension of the sinking fund in time of war legitimate, but it is the fulfilment of the very purpose for which the fund exists. On the other hand, the nation is entitled to complain bitterly of the way in which its permanent interests have been sacrificed for momentary gain by the financiers who in 1888, 1890 and 1899 wantonly cut down the provision made by Sir Stafford Northcote for the reduction of the debt. Had the fixed annual charge remained at the figure at which he settled it, the country would have had in hand, towards meeting the enormous cost of the South African war, a revenue of about £12,000,000, immediately available without extra taxation.

In addition to the reduction of debt effected by sinking funds and other deliberate methods, England has enjoyed the good fortune of several windfalls. Her creditors have, from time to time, died leaving no representatives, and the unclaimed stock and accumulated dividends, after a reasonable interval, have been devoted to the reduction of the debt. The same plan has been pursued with unclaimed funds in the Court of Chancery. Altogether stock to the amount of over £8,000,000 has been cancelled in this way.

Even more interesting, from the human side, is the very considerable sum that the State has received from donations and bequests, specially given for the reduction of the debt. The first of these gifts was in 1809, when a Mr. Burgis, of Isleworth, bequeathed £200 consols for the reduction of the National Debt.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Among later donors, Anna Maria Reynolds stands for nearly £60,000 given in different years, and John Ashton for £193,000. In 1829, a "Female Patriot" gave £6; while, some years later, Mr. William Pithy Booth gave his full name and the sum of six shillings and sixpence. Another curious donation is 38,500 francs (about £1,500) sent anonymously from Paris. These voluntary gifts have continued intermittently down to the present time, and stock to the value of no less than £1,020,000 has been cancelled by this means.

It would too greatly prolong this article to enter into details with regard to the successive stages by which the rate of interest on the public debt has been reduced to its present figure. It is clear that a conversion of debt from a high rate of interest to a lower rate cannot be effected without dishonesty, except at times when the credit of the country is good and capital is plentiful. Since Charles II.'s breach of faith above recorded, and the unfair settlement that followed it, the British Government has never played its creditors false. The numerous conversions of debt effected have always been voluntary, the creditors being given the option of accepting a lower rate of interest or of being paid off in cash. The last conversion was in 1888, when the enormous sum of £565,000,000, standing in various three per cent. stocks, was converted into one stock bearing interest at the rate of two and three-quarters per cent. till 1903, and subsequently two and a half per cent. until 1923, when it is redeemable at par. The annual saving of interest in 1888 by this conversion was £1,440,000.

Before presenting in tabular form a final statement of the debt as it now exists, it is necessary to explain that, while rapidly paying off its main debt, the British Government has of late years frequently raised temporary loans for special purposes. This process has been a good deal criticized, but it is fairly defensible. These loans are not charged upon the general debt account, but are met by special annual payments, spread over a short term of years. Thus, if the army wants new barracks on a large scale, the expenditure is spread over, say, ten years by raising a special loan, and the ten instalments of interest and repayment will each year be debited to army expenditure.

These special loans are quite distinct from the ordinary unfunded debt, which consists of Treasury Bills or Exchequer Bills or deficiency advances by the Bank of England. Such bills and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advances are only required because of the irregularity with which the revenue comes in at different seasons of the year, whereas most of the expenditure is continuous. In a word, the sole object of the present unfunded debt is to save the Government from the necessity of keeping an extravagantly large working balance.

With these explanations, the following table will probably be intelligible:

NATIONAL DEBT ON MARCH 31ST, 1900.

Funded Debt—		
Consols, 2¾% to 1903, then 2½%; redeemable 1923....		£502,657,133
Due to Banks of England and Ireland, 2¾%	13,645,869	
2¾ per cents redeemable 1905.....	4,635,991	
2½ per cents redeemable 1905.....	31,667,904	
		£552,606,897
Terminable Annuities—		
Held by the public.....	12,913,128	
Held by Post Office Savings Bank, etc.....	47,325,757	
		60,238,885
Unfunded Debt (Treasury Bills).....		16,133,000
Lapsing Loans for special purposes.....		10,186,482
Total Gross Liabilities.....		£639,165,264

This table represents the British National Debt as it stood on March 31st, 1900, and it is interesting to observe that though the South African war had then been in progress for five months, the net increase to the debt as compared with the previous year was only about £4,000,000. Soon after the above date, however, a loan of £30,000,000 was raised, and parliamentary sanction was given to further borrowing. By March 31st, 1901, the debt had risen to £703,000,000, and it was then estimated that the effect of the war would be to increase the debt by a total of more than £100,000,000.

In addition to the actual liabilities tabulated above, the British Government has certain contingent liabilities, principally on account of various foreign or colonial debts guaranteed by Parliament. In most cases, there is no danger of these contingent liabilities ever becoming actual; and, in any case, the risk is covered many hundred times over by the marketable property possessed by the Government in the shape of the Suez Canal Shares bought by Lord Beaconsfield for £4,000,000 and now valued at £25,000,000; and in the shape of various loans to foreign powers; of a large amount of real estate; of valuable machinery and materials in dockyards and arsenals; of ships and guns and stores of ammunition. All these are items which a strict accountant would bring into the national balance sheet; but, as the British Govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment has no immediate intention of going into liquidation, it is somewhat futile even to speculate as to the figure that the Royal Navy, for example, would fetch in the open market.

The true burden of the British debt is represented by the annual charge upon it. The actual figures in tabular form are:

DEBT CHARGE FOR YEAR ENDING MARCH 31ST, 1900.

	Interest.	Reduction of Capital.
Funded Debt	£15,242,192	£19,876
Terminable Annuities—		
Held by public	300,097	1,030,767
Held by Savings Bank, etc.	1,208,532	4,751,094
Unfunded Debt—		
Treasury Bills	489,235	.....
Lapsing Loans	184,918	336,129
Management	174,864	.....
	£17,599,838	£6,137,866
Total Gross Charge		£23,737,704

It will be observed that more than six millions sterling was expended in the reduction of the debt, although the British Government had already begun to borrow for the South African war. Part of this reduction, namely, that on terminable annuities held by the public and that on lapsing loans was inevitable, for a failure to reduce capital as well as pay interest would have involved, in the one case, a breach of faith with the public, in the other, the readjustment of some rather elaborate fiscal and parliamentary arrangements. The rest of the reduction was due to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's misconception of the nature of a sinking fund, to which reference has been made above. He recovered from this misconception a few days before the close of the financial year in question, and appears to have abandond the delusion that there is any merit in paying off debt with one hand while borrowing larger sums with the other.

In both the tables above the figures of the gross debt and the gross charge are given. But the British Government possesses one or two interest-bearing investments which ought properly to be brought into the account. We need not trouble ourselves with their capital value, which varies largely with the fluctuations of the market. The important point is that these investments, and notably the Suez Canal Shares, considerably reduce the annual burden of the debt. The figures appear under various heads in the published Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom, but the total for the year ending March 31st, 1900, may be taken at £837,834, for interest alone, apart from repay-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments of capital. Thus the net charge on the British Exchequer for interest and management of debt in that year was only £16,762,000. If to this amount we add the sum which it was compulsory to spend on the reduction of capital, we find that the whole annual burden of the British debt was, in March, 1900, very little over £18,000,000.

Taking this figure, and adopting Dudley Baxter's calculations for the earlier years, the comparison works out as follows:

COMPARATIVE BURDEN OF THE NATIONAL DEBT AT DIFFERENT PERIODS.

	Annual charge per head of population. s.	d.
1763, End of Seven Years' War	9	7
1784, End of American War of Independence	14	2
1815, End of Napoleonic wars	34	8
1870, After prolonged peace	15	9
1900, At beginning of South African War	9	0

Needless to say, these figures do not tell the whole story, for the increase in the wealth of the country has made burdens which at the beginning of the century were terrible now appear light. The most accurate evidence of the growth of national wealth is furnished by the Income Tax returns. They show that, allowing for the difference of rate, the yield of the Income Tax has increased nearly threefold since 1815, partly through the growth in the size of large incomes, and still more through the increased number of moderate incomes. The improvement in the position of the working classes has been, at least, as great as that of the richer classes; and it is, therefore, safe to assume that the average income throughout the kingdom has nearly trebled in the last eighty-five years. As the above table shows that the charge of the debt per head is little more than one-fourth of what it then was, it is within the mark to say that the real burden of the National Debt in the last year of the nineteenth century was only *one-tenth* of what it was at the end of the Great War.

With this statement, it is possible to pass from the National Debt to the subject of local indebtedness. This latter debt, though made up of a multiplicity of items, is in reality of a very simple character. The total sum owing is roughly £300,000,000, or about half the National Debt. It is divided between England, Scotland and Ireland, as follows:

England and Wales	£252,133,000
Scotland	38,452,000
Ireland	10,548,000
	£301,133,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The whole of this money has been borrowed for local improvements, generally of a permanent character. The following analysis for England and Wales will show the class of work on which the money has been spent:

PURPOSES ON WHICH LOAN MONEY HAS BEEN EXPENDED BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

Workhouses, infirmaries and hospitals	£10,080,000
Lunatic asylums	4,792,000
Municipal buildings, including Assize Courts, Police Stations, Fire Stations, and Markets	13,188,000
Schools	26,921,000
Street improvements and bridges	34,557,000
Gas works	17,434,000
Electric lighting	3,112,000
Waterworks	46,261,000
Sewerage	26,057,000
Cemeteries	2,699,000
Parks, pleasure grounds, libraries, museums, public baths, etc.	7,885,000
Harbors and docks	33,859,000
Laborers' dwellings	4,609,000
Manchester Ship Canal*	5,128,000
Miscellaneous public improvements	15,551,000
	£252,133,000

By far the larger portion of the local debt throughout the kingdom has been borrowed on such security as the different local authorities are themselves able to offer to the public. How good that security is may be inferred from the fact that British Corporation stocks are quoted on the Stock Exchange at prices which only allow to investors a return of barely three per cent. on their capital. Corporation stocks are, in fact, regarded—with one or two insignificant exceptions—as second only to Consols as a safe investment.

But, in addition to the great municipal corporations, there are many smaller local authorities who, if they attempted to borrow on their own security, would have to pay an extravagant rate of interest. To assist these bodies, a system has been devised by which local borrowers are enabled to have the advantage of imperial credit.

The principle of State loans to local bodies, or even to private individuals, is well over a hundred years old. The earliest recorded instance appears at first sight somewhat quaint. In 1793, an Act of Parliament was passed authorizing the Government to lend money to "such persons as may be desirous to accept the same." This apparently wholesale offer was, however, accompanied by conditions that choked off the majority of would-be borrowers. The only object of Parliament, in fact,

* The Corporation of the City of Manchester has lent to the Ship Canal Company large sums of money on the security of the local taxation of the city.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was to assist substantial men of business at a moment of commercial panic. Interest was fixed at ten per cent., and good security was required. On these terms, loans to the amount of over £2,000,000 were taken up, and the accommodation doubtless helped greatly to stay the panic. The experiment was repeated on a smaller scale six years later, for the "relief of merchants trading between Liverpool and Lancaster," and again in 1811 for the "relief of commercial credit." In all these cases, the money lent was punctually repaid, with interest in full. A large loan was also made by the Government in 1795, for the relief of persons in the islands of Grenada and St. Vincent, and this, too, was fully repaid. On the other hand, several of the earlier public loans have had to be written off as bad debts; for example, £50,000 for the Welland Canal in Canada, £120,000 for the improvement of Leith Harbor in Scotland, and £1,370,000 for the construction of workhouses in Ireland.

Among the purposes for which State loans have been made to local bodies, the following may be mentioned: The construction of harbors, docks and piers; the construction of improved dwellings for the working classes; the building of schools, asylums and workhouses; the drainage of land, and within the last few years advances to Irish tenants to enable them to buy the freehold of their farms.

In all these cases, down to the year 1887, the Government was the actual lender of the money, borrowing with one hand from the public, and lending with the other to local bodies and private individuals. In 1887, an improved system was devised. In order to simplify the public accounts, the management of these local loans was detached from the direct operations of the Government, and a separate Local Loans Fund was created. This fund is managed by that conveniently neutral body, the National Debt Commission. The Commissioners raise money by issuing from time to time a separate stock, known as the Local Loans Stock. The amount of this stock now outstanding is a little over £38,000,000. It is a three per cent. stock redeemable in 1912, and it was quoted in January, 1901, at 98 to 99. The Imperial Government guarantees the payment of interest. With the money thus raised, the National Debt Commissioners make loans to local authorities on terms approved by the Treasury. In other words, the National Debt Commissioners, in this respect, act as middlemen between the smaller

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

local bodies and the public; and, having the guarantee of the Imperial Government behind them, they are able to borrow, and therefore to lend, on very favorable terms. The total amount of their outstanding loans is a little over £39,000,000, or about one-eighth of the local debt of the United Kingdom.

It will be convenient to append a condensed table showing the whole operation of the system of State loans or State-guaranteed loans, including, of course, the loans made out of the Local Loans Fund. The statement only deals with capital advances and repayments, no calculation being made of the loss to the State for unpaid interest.

GOVERNMENT LOANS TO LOCAL BODIES.

From 1793 to 1898.

Localities of Borrowers.	Advanced to Borrowers. £	Repaid by Borrowers. £	Remitted. £	Outstanding. £
England and Wales.....	63,100,000	42,900,000	500,000	19,700,000
Scotland	10,300,000	6,700,000	400,000	3,200,000
Ireland	55,900,000	29,100,000	10,500,000	16,300,000
Colonial	3,700,000	2,700,000	900,000	100,000
Totals	133,000,000	81,400,000	12,300,000	39,300,000

Practically, the whole of the local debt of the United Kingdom has been incurred within the last sixty or seventy years, and the larger portion of it within the last twenty or thirty. It still continues to grow rapidly, although Parliament has made provision for compelling local authorities to pay off gradually each loan raised. The excuse of the local authorities for raising fresh loans is always the same, that it is unfair to throw upon the existing body of ratepayers the whole cost of improvements that may last for several generations. That argument might serve if the loans were raised only for short periods of ten or twelve years; but, when the periods are thirty, or even as long as sixty years, it is extremely doubtful whether posterity gets any equivalent return for the burden imposed upon it. New inventions and changes of fashion destroy the value of capital improvements even more rapidly than the hand of time, and it is only necessary to compare the large sum spent out of loans by municipal authorities in England on gas lighting, with the small sum spent on electric lighting, to realize the improvidence of municipal borrowing on long terms.

The practical difficulty in the way of diminishing local indebtedness is the objection of the local ratepayer to bearing fresh taxation. That objection mainly arises from the system that prevails in England of levying the whole of the "rates," or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

local taxes, upon the occupiers of land or houses. Ultimately, there can be no doubt that the burden of any regular charge on fixed property falls not on the occupier, but on the owner of the property; but the average occupier—especially in districts where rents as well as rates are rising—cannot be convinced that, if he paid no rates, he would have to pay more rent, and that, consequently, the rates are a deduction from his landlord's income and not from his own. This want of economic perception on the part of the average ratepayer is, however, more intelligible than the refusal of Parliament to amend the law, so as to make the apparent incidence of the tax coincide with its real incidence. Such refusal is the less excusable, because an admirable solution of the problem already exists in what is known as Schedule A of the Imperial Income Tax—a tax upon fixed property, levied in so scientific a manner as to compel every person interested in any piece of property to pay in exact proportion to his interest. This tax is levied at a trifling cost to the State, and is an almost unique example of a direct tax which gives rise to no complaint from the taxpayer. If this imperial model were copied in the system of local taxation, and if at the same time some provision were made for taxing personalty, as well as realty, for local purposes, there is every reason to believe that local authorities would begin to reduce their present excessive debt. HAROLD COX.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LATE EMPRESS FREDERICK.

BY A PERSONAL FRIEND OF HER MAJESTY.

THE death of the Empress Frederick will be deeply regretted by those of the past generation who followed closely the stirring events which culminated in the unity of the German Empire, and the subsequent development of the great country in which Her Majesty, as wife of Frederick, Crown Prince of Germany, played so important a part. She enjoyed the enviable distinction of being both feared and disliked by Prince Bismarck; whilst the unseemly discussions and controversies around the death-bed of her illustrious husband gained her the sympathy of all upright, God-fearing men.

Victoria Adelaide Maria Louisa, Princess Royal of Great Britain and Ireland, eldest child of Victoria, Queen of England, was born at Windsor on the 21st of November, 1840.

Contemporary history contains but slight record of her early life. In the private life of the Queen, published anonymously in 1897, the following statement appears:

"Being sent to bed in the daytime was the chief punishment meted out to the Princesses; and the Princess Royal, who, as she grew in years, proved a very high-spirited child, spent many more hours than she can now count in the solitude of her own chamber. The Princess was in fact most difficult to manage."

In Sir Rennell Rodd's "Frederick, Crown Prince and Emperor," appears the following:

"On the 29th of September, 1855, when the Royal party were riding unattended over the moors, a spray of the rare white heather, which the Prince dismounted to pluck and offer to his future bride, drew the secret from his lips; and the happy alliance was arranged, not by the manoeuvring of diplomacy or the scheming of politicians, but naturally, and as in the everyday world, by the spontaneous impulse of two young hearts toward each other. As the Prince himself expressed it: 'It was not politics, it was not ambition; it was my heart.'"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the nomination of the Prince, father of the bridegroom, to the Regency of Prussia, the date of the marriage was definitely settled for the 25th of January, 1858.

The wedding took place at the Chapel Royal, St. James's Palace. An eye-witness describing the scene as the procession left the church wrote:

"The light of happiness in the eyes of the bride appealed to the most reserved among the spectators, and an audible 'God bless you!' passed from mouth to mouth along the line."

The wedding rings were made of pure Silesian gold, whilst the six bridesmaids, of England's noblest families, wore the emblematic white heather, in memory of the Prince's wooing.

The short honeymoon was spent at Windsor, and then in a heavy snowstorm the beloved Princess Royal of England turned her back on the happy land of her birth and went to meet the untried and the new, to dwell with strange faces, different ideas and ideals, unfamiliar associations. The young couple were received with enthusiasm throughout their journey to Berlin, where, shortly after their arrival, they took up their residence in the Palace on the Unter den Linden. There, on the 27th of January, 1859, the present Emperor was born.

History relates but few details of her early married life, beyond the fact that her surroundings were simple and artistic. These latter efforts were recognized by the Royal Academy of Arts in Berlin granting her a diploma as an honorary member in 1861. The Crown Princess was a very good artist. Those who can recall the Crimean war, the distress and sorrow caused thereby, the innumerable charities and bazaars that were started for the relief of the widows and orphans of the brave soldiers, will remember the charming water-color drawing, from the able brush of the Princess Royal, as she then was, of the tender wife bending over the body of her wounded husband, and tending him with so much care and solicitude. This picture was sold for the benefit of the Royal Patriotic Fund and brought a large sum, not only on account of its clever composition, but because it reflected the gentle nature, the sympathy for the afflicted, and the readiness to assist them, of the Royal girl of but fifteen summers. Her brilliant marriage, her exalted position in after years, in no way clouded that gentleness of heart, as was shown by the solicitude

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she evinced for the stricken ones in the great German wars of 1864, 1866 and 1870, and, I may add, in the present Boer war.

Her Majesty was undoubtedly a gifted woman, and up to the day of her death she cultivated the friendship of those interested in art. She possessed a wonderful knowledge of Italian Art of the Renaissance, and was a devoted admirer of Italy, the Mother of Art. Her Castle at Friedrichshof was a museum in itself of precious works, pictures and statuary. As a linguist she was unequalled, and could carry on a conversation in four languages with consummate ease. On one occasion, when I had the honor of lunching with Her Majesty, she addressed me in Italian, saying: "You will correct my mistakes, but I do love speaking the dear language;" and she continued doing so throughout lunch.

She took a warm interest in the excavations in Crete, and kept up a long correspondence with one of their chief promoters, whilst her love of music was well known; and she ever remained a faithful friend to the Countess von Bülow, daughter of Minghetti, the well-known Italian statesman, a most gifted and distinguished pianist.

Sidney Whitman, in his life of the Emperor Frederick, describes the home life of the Princess as told by Gustav zu Putlitz, who held the office of Chamberlain to the Crown Princess, in letters to his wife:

"As I was passing through the drawing-room on the way to my room, I came upon the Crown Princess with Countess Hedwig Brühl, the former being engaged in searching for the text of a song of Goethe's which she partly knew from memory, while Hedwig played the air. They could not find the song in Goethe, and I did so for them. Then we had a most interesting conversation about literature. The Crown Princess is marvellously well-read; she has literally read everything, and knows everything more or less by heart. She showed us a print, which had just arrived, of a drawing she had executed for the benefit of the Crown Prince's fund. It consists of four pictures as a souvenir of the victory at Düppel—four soldiers, full length figures, representing four different branches of the service. The first, before the attack (morning); the second, waving the standard (noon); the third, wounded, listening to 'Now thank we all our God' (afternoon); the fourth, the victor, with helmet and laurel wreath, standing mourning at an open grave (evening). The last was finished, and was exceedingly powerful and natural, without any sentimentality. It is conceived with real genius and most artistically executed. This young Princess has more than average gifts, and, besides, is more cultured than any woman I know of her age. * * * * And then she has such charming manners, which put one perfectly at one's ease in spite of royal etiquette."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Again, on the 27th of June, 1864, he writes as follows:

"This morning I had just closed your letter when, at nine o'clock, the Crown Princess sent for me in the garden. A despatch from the Crown Prince gave her permission to remain, unless the naval captains think it likely that the Danes may land on the Island of Rügen. I telegraphed in all directions. Six Danish ships are in sight, but our naval officers think there is very little danger.

"Breakfast at ten; then a drive to the shooting box. The view from the tower gives a fine panorama of the island. A Danish ship was in sight, and also our gunboats cruising round the island. The Crown Princess ascended the tower. I do not know what she has not a passion for—music, art, literature, the army, the navy, riding and hunting. On leaving, she went down the mountain on foot, and I accompanied her through the rain-swept wood. She took the last number of the *Grenzboten* from her pocket, and gave it to me. It is astonishing that she not only reads, but commits everything to memory; and she discusses history like a historian, with excellent judgment and decision."

Up to 1864, the life of the Crown Princess had been an ideal one; she was happy in her home, contented with her lot in every sense, and she invariably accompanied her husband on his official visits. It must be recalled that, at the time of her marriage, King Frederick William the Fourth was on the throne of Prussia, although his brother was Regent; hence, she was immediately launched amongst all the differences which existed between her husband and the Ministers (Manteuffel and his colleagues). She was but a child, and should have been pardoned for the great love she bore to the home of her birth. No one sympathized with her in this strong feeling more than her loving husband, although it was never fully understood by public opinion in the land of her adoption. No cloud had crossed the horizon beyond the differences that existed between the Prince and Bismarck, and naturally the latter gave her credit for these. Dr. Moritz Busch relates that he took the liberty, in 1870, of asking Count Bismarck what sort of woman the Crown Princess was, and whether she had much influence over her husband. The Count said:

"I think not; and as to her intelligence, she is a clever woman; clever in a womanly way. She is not able to disguise her feelings, or at least not always. I have cost her many tears, and she could not conceal how angry she was with me after the annexations" (that is to say, of Schleswig and Hanover). "She could hardly bear the sight of me, but that feeling has now somewhat subsided. She once asked me to bring her a glass of water, and, as I handed it to her, she said to a lady-in-waiting who sat near, and whose name I forget; 'He has cost me as many tears as there is water in this glass.' But that is all over now."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Danish war and the subsequent annexation of Schleswig was her first sorrow, and naturally so, as her beloved husband left her to fight against Denmark, the home of the Princess of Wales, her favorite brother's consort.

During the anxious time preceding the Austrian campaign a second daughter was born, and received the name of Victoria.

It is well known that the Crown Prince was entirely opposed to Bismarck's policy at this time; and in this he was fully supported by the Crown Princess, and very possibly influenced, as, at one period of the negotiations, the mediation of Queen Victoria was suggested but refused by Bismarck.

On the departure of the Crown Prince for the war, his illustrious Consort was in sad trouble, as her youngest son, Sigismund —born September 15th, 1864—fell seriously ill, and eventually died. But Her Royal Highness, setting aside her domestic grief, devoted all her energies to good works in the interests of the sick and wounded, fitting up a number of rooms in her palace at Berlin for the reception of wounded officers.

The Crown Princess accompanied her husband when he went to Paris as President of the Prussian Committee at the French International Exhibition of 1867, entering into all the gaieties of the Imperial Court. It was in Paris that she met Ernest Renan, the author of the *"Vie de Jésus,"* who spoke of her afterward as a "very remarkable woman."

On the occasion of the marriage of the late King Humbert of Italy, in 1868, and at the subsequent ceremony of the opening of the Suez Canal, the Crown Princess did not accompany her husband, partly because she was in delicate health, and partly because of the illness of Prince Waldemar. He was always a weakly child, and only lived to the age of eleven, dying on the 27th of March, 1879. Those of my readers who have visited the Emperor Frederick's Mausoleum at Potsdam will recollect the little side chapel, in which rest the remains of Prince Waldemar and his brother Sigismund.

On the outbreak of the Franco-German war, a third daughter, who received the name of Sophie, was born to the royal couple. As soon as the health of the Crown Princess was sufficiently restored, she by her energy and devotion to duty set an example of self-sacrifice in the interests of the sick and wounded, which was the admiration of all with whom she was thrown in contact.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is stated that, in her letters to her husband, she discussed political questions, and there is no doubt that Prince Bismarck was of opinion that the Crown Princess influenced her husband against the bombardment of Paris, which, much against Prince Bismarck's advice, was at the Crown Prince's instigation so often postponed. Public opinion in Berlin was very wroth against her for this alleged interference.

In April, 1873, on the occasion of a visit to the Imperial Court at Vienna, Her Royal Highness made the acquaintance of the portrait painter, Heinrich von Angeli, who describes her as a lady endowed with every adornment of heart and mind. During the next few years, perhaps the happiest of her life, nothing of special moment took place. They were spent in a homely manner, in the education of her children, the development of technical training, the industrial training of women, and many other similar undertakings. State visits, happy holiday trips were paid to Venice and England. On February 18th, 1878, Princess Charlotte, the eldest daughter, was married to the Hereditary Prince Bernhard of Saxe-Meiningen, a union which promised to be a happy one in every way; and this was followed by the betrothal, in 1880, of Prince William (the present Emperor) to the Princess Augusta Victoria of Schleswig-Holstein, an alliance which met with the heartiest approval of both parents, as it was one of mutual and deep-seated affection.

The anxiety of the Crown Princess as to the health of her illustrious husband was first aroused in the autumn of 1886, when, after returning from a drive on the Riviera, he contracted a severe cold, from which his throat never recovered. As the hoarseness increased, so did the apprehensions of the Princess. The ablest German specialists were called in, and it was only natural that Professor Bergmann, before finally deciding to operate, should beg the Princess to obtain the opinion of yet another specialist on diseases of throat. It was then decided that the distinguished English surgeon, Sir Morell Mackenzie, should be called in; his report, supported by the opinion of Professor Virchow, set aside the idea that an immediate operation was necessary, and Mackenzie assumed the further treatment of the case.

The Crown Princess's devotion to her dying husband during these sad days is too well known to need recapitulation. The sceptre of power was almost within her reach; her father-in-law,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the reigning Emperor, had already attained the great age of ninety-one, and it was but natural that her ambition hoped to see her loved one on the throne as Emperor.

On March 9th, 1888, the first German Emperor passed peacefully away; and on the following day the Crown Princess, now Empress, accompanied her husband to Berlin, leaving San Remo and its lovely climate with tears of regret. The controversies between the German and English surgeons, far from abating, increased a hundredfold on the accession of the Emperor Frederick to the throne. His brief reign of ninety-three days was embittered by the discussions which took place over the projected marriage of Prince Alexander of Battenberg, Prince of Bulgaria, to Princess Victoria, second daughter of the Empress Frederick. It was strongly objected to on political grounds by Prince Bismarck, but supported on those of mutual love and admiration by the Empress.

The following appears in Busch's life of Bismarck, and is interesting as showing the real feeling of the Germans toward the Empress Frederick:

"April 28th, 1888.

"This afternoon met Bucher in the Königin Augusta Strasse. * * * * He said smilingly: 'I have just heard a surprising piece of news. Grandmamma behaved quite sensibly at Charlottenburg. She declared the attitude of Prince Bismarck in the Battenberg marriage scheme to be quite correct, and urged her daughter to change her ways. Of course it was very nice of her not to forget her own country and to wish to benefit it where it was possible for her to do so, but she needed the attachment of the Germans, and should endeavor to secure it; and finally she brought about a reconciliation between Prince William (the present Emperor) and his mother.' I asked: 'Have you that on good authority?' 'On very good authority,' he replied. 'Well,' I said, 'that is highly satisfactory, and we shall act accordingly in the immediate future; for of course we do not hate Victoria II. on account of her extraction, but because she feels as an Englishwoman and wishes to promote English interests at our expense, and because she despises us Germans. The question is whether in the long run she will heed this maternal admonition.' "

Prince Bismarck thus describes his relations with the Empress Frederick at this time:

"I was always on the best of terms with the Emperor Frederick and his Consort, the Empress Victoria. Any differences of opinion between us were discussed with their Majesties in the most friendly way. The Empress Victoria is, moreover, very clever and decided. When I appeared with some business for her Imperial Consort, she

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

frequently entered the sick room before me to prepare him and gain him over for my project."

The Empress Frederick became a widow on the 15th of June, 1888. Her first written message is recorded as follows:

"She who was so proud and happy to be the wife of your only son mourns with you, poor Mother. No mother ever had such a son. Be strong and proud in your grief. Even this morning he sent you a greeting. Victoria."

During her widowhood, the Empress lived a very retired life, devoting herself to good works and charitable enterprises.

There was at one time an undoubted tension between Her Majesty and her son, the Emperor William, but that passed long since, and the hatchet was buried in the waters of Lethe. Within sight of the picturesque old Castle of Kronberg, at the foot of the Taunus range of mountains, and overlooking the valley of the Main, the Empress Frederick reigned supreme in the Castle of Friedrichshof, built after her own heart, and filled with treasures collected in her happy travels through Italy. Here, in her latter days, was to be found a society composed of distinguished professors in art, music and literature, officers from the neighboring garrison of Frankfort, an English ex-Cabinet Minister or two from Homburg, occasionally some lovely American who had married into one of Germany's noble families; and here, assisted by her graceful favorite daughter, Princess Margaret of Hesse, would the Empress dispense her hospitality with a simplicity and absence of pomp which put all her guests at their ease.

Her ladies and gentlemen in waiting were devoted to her. One of the latter fought a duel when once her good name was assailed, and suffered the penalty of the law for so doing with imprisonment in a fortress. A staunch Protestant through life, she was no bigot, and she respected the opinions of those who differed with her in matters of conscience. I recollect Her Majesty assisting at the opening of the new Roman Catholic Church at Homburg v. d. Höhe in 1895, and afterward, in course of conversation, strongly supporting the claims of the Little Sisters at their educational convent, simply on account of the bright example they set and the admirable system of teaching they had established.

Another interesting episode occurs to me of a visit which I paid Her Majesty on a bright Sunday afternoon in January,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1900, at the small, unpretentious Villa Pearse, beautifully situated on the Gulf of Lerici, adjoining that of Spezia. The Italian Naval Commander-in-Chief took me out in his steam pinnace from the dockyard of the famous Italian fortress. He told me she was very ill, and I must be prepared to see a great change. I sent up my card to Baron Seckendorf, who kindly received me and said: "Her Majesty is finishing a sketch in the garden, but will be pleased to receive you in half an hour." On my return, I met her walking down the garden, evidently in pain; but she greeted me with the same sweet, sad smile, never to be forgotten by those who knew her, and in the same soft, musical voice which was one of her greatest charms. When we were seated in the drawing room, she said: "Have you brought me good news? Are not these reverses in Africa awful? Has Lord Roberts arrived? What do you think will happen?" and a thousand and one similar questions. After I had replied, she said: "I am working hard all day and every day at Tam o' Shanters, comforters and socks for the poor soldiers; it is the only solace I have in these sad times, and it is the only way in which I can show my sympathy. As an Englishwoman, I could not return to Germany at the present moment; the sympathy of the public is misdirected by the press, which is misinformed; but, thank God, the sympathies of my son, the Emperor, are entirely with England, and it is to the interest of Germany that they should be so." Ah, yes! How well I knew that being of English birth was the only reproach her enemies could bring against her. From the day of her marriage, she had striven to do her duty to her adopted country, but she refused to give up the great privilege of her birthright, and endeavored to teach the advantages that she had learnt in England, and which were invariably misunderstood.

The Empress Frederick was not a beauty in the strict sense of the word; but her gracious smile, sad as it was in her latter days, always appealed to the hardest of hearts. She was of average height, with a marked presence and graceful, rounded figure. In character she resembled her mother, but she was wanting in that full measure of tact which so characterized Queen Victoria through her long life and reign. As a horsewoman she was unequalled, and up to and even within the last three years she enjoyed riding. One of her suite in talking to me one day,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attributed her fatal illness to a fall she had when riding one morning in the forest round Kronberg.

The Empress Frederick was a loving daughter, a faithful wife, a devoted mother. Her character was misunderstood in the land of her adoption, which was not ripe for the advent of such a pioneer of liberal thought; she went there fifty years too soon. Her great influence, her unbounded energy, were devoted to the cause of freedom and justice, to the emancipation of women, the protection of the weak, the development of all that is most noble in man's nature, to the cultivation of art, to the relief of the sick and the support of those in trouble. She was fearless in speech, courageous in her convictions, confident in her strength. She, alas, had many enemies, jealous of her great influence, envious of her universal knowledge; but, on the other hand, she had devoted friends, who will always cherish the recollection of her great qualities, her loving nature, and her brilliant example of uprightness. A distinguished Royal physician is reported to have said that there were three races of mankind—a Royal race, a white race, and a black race.

When the history of the Empress Frederick's life is written in years to come—not in the fierce light of popular prejudice still subsisting in Germany as illustrated by Bismarck, who, to a great extent, encouraged this feeling when he invariably alluded to her as "the Englishwoman, the Guelph"—she will be handed down to posterity as one of the most remarkable women of the Royal race—a daughter of a great Queen, the Mother of a powerful Emperor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PHANTOM FORTRESS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

BY J. M. BUCKLEY, LL.D.

Though man a thinking being is designed,
Few use the great prerogative of mind.
How few think justly of the thinking few!
How many never think, who think they do!

By publishing in the July number "The Absurd Paradox of Christian Science," the North American Review has done what the Court of this City in the Brush Will Case and of Boston in the Woodbury Libel Suit failed to do, namely: bring the leaders of Christian Science to book. For the apostles of Mrs. Eddy do not imitate the apostles of Christ. Those were ever ready to debate anywhere with saint or respectful sinner. Besides responding fearlessly to the Epicurians and Stoics on Mars Hill, Paul disputed daily at Ephesus for more than two years in the school of one Tyrannus, a sort of forerunner of the Nineteenth Century Club, but these prefer to speak when they cannot be answered.

But in the August Review the Publication Committee, through one of its members, has placed itself on record in the attitude of a controvertist. It is improbable that the author of "The Simple Logic of Christian Science" would issue this manifesto without the approbation of his fellow members and of the High Priestess herself. We now know as much of their "views" as Christian Scientists are willing to acknowledge to the public.

The article includes admissions, criticisms, a theory whereby to explain how any one could think Christian Science an "Absurd Paradox," personal references to the writer of that article, various passages of Scripture, some philosophic and scientific terms, one or two appeals to "common sense," and several hundred asser-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, most of them resembling a class of the population inquired into by the State, because they have "no visible means of support," others being connected with each other—apparently only for rhetorical reasons—by the word "therefore." The spirit of the whole seems serious, and there is an avowed attempt to state the germs of the conception known as Christian Science.

Personal allusions can be eliminated from the discussion as shedding no light on the problem.

The ADMISSIONS in the Simple Logic are of the first importance.

On page 242, August number of NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, are these statements:

"It is generally conceded that the cures effected by Christian Science are not always instantaneous; and that many of the surgical cases have been turned over to surgeons. But this does not prove that the cures in Christian Science differ in quality from those performed by Jesus and his disciples. Christian Scientists are only beginners in this wonderful work; they have barely entered upon their demonstrations of the healing power of Mind, and they are still learning their A B C at the feet of the Master. They will accomplish better results later on."

Their cures, then, are not always instantaneous. This puts them out of line with the methods of Christ and the Apostles. In trying to prove that their "cures" do not "differ in quality from those performed by Christ and His disciples," Mrs. Eddy's spokesman has searched the New Testament and found one case which he adduces as "not instantaneous." It is in Mark, vii., 23-25:

"And he took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town; and when he had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw aught.

"And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees, walking.

"After that he put his hands again upon his eyes, and made him look up; and he was restored, and saw every man clearly."

Daring to the point of sacrilege is the comparison of their halting measures—by their own confession often extending to more than twenty treatments and sometimes to twice that number—with the operation of Christ in the healing of the blind man, when, at the *first* touch, sight was restored, and, at the *second*, accurately adjusted.

Another loophole is sought in the declaration that even "Jesus

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not able to do many mighty works" in his own country "because of their unbelief."

The representative did not read the accounts in Luke and John, which show that as the countrymen and kindred of Jesus refused to hear him, he left the country followed by the few who believed. Had he compared the two versions of those who speak specifically of the matter he would have been spared humiliation. For Matthew, xiii., 58, says: "And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief." Mark, vi., 5, relates that "he could there do no mighty work because of their unbelief," but adds: *"save that He laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them."* The very thing, then, which Christian Scientists usually cannot do if persons opposed are present, Christ did under these untoward circumstances.

The representative of Eddyism concedes that *"many* of the surgical cases have been turned over to surgeons." The reader should not deceive himself by the word *surgical.* For it relates only to a mode of treatment and not to disease. Broken bones, gangrene, cancer, malformations, pus that will kill unless an outlet be found for it, and the abnormal condition of an appendix, bear the same relation to "mortal mind" and its beliefs, and to Immortal Mind, that other disorders bear. Why, then, do they turn them over to surgeons? Only because they cannot effect a return to the normal by their methods. Usually the sort they turn over are such as they see with their own "mortal mind" and "human sense" will die or disgrace them if they do not. Often General Hospitals and surgeons find that such surgical cases are not surrendered till they are incurable, though they might have been made whole or helped before.

Mrs. Eddy after experiment found that she could do nothing reliable with a large class of cases, and early in her career revealed the poverty of her system by saying to her pupils:

"Until the advancing age admits the efficacy and supremacy of Mind, it is better to leave surgery and the adjustment of broken bones and dislocations to the fingers of a surgeon, while you confine yourself chiefly to mental reconstruction, and the prevention of inflammation."

"Inflammation," then, is a fact to be reckoned with.

Again, twenty-five years later, she said:

"The practice of surgery is not introduced into Christian Science,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whose rules and methods are based upon the examples of Jesus and his follows."

Her rules and methods are in all respects contrary to the methods and examples of Christ and his followers. Imagine Him who made the "maimed every whit whole" waiting for the "advancing age" and meanwhile calling for a surgeon!

The representative makes this surprising admission:

"Paul's prescription to Timothy of 'a little wine for his stomach's sake'; and often infirmities seem to have been a concession to material methods."

Paul understood himself and knew that there is no incompatibility between using natural means and faith in and prayer to God for the sick. He knew even then that much wine is most pernicious, and said: "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess." But the process of distillation not having been invented, and the fortifying of wine with alcohol being unknown, Paul knew that among the few recognized remedies wine administered with caution and restricted to *"a little"* might serve a useful purpose. A weak stomach and other infirmities were as real to Timothy as strong digestion and unfailing energy were to Peter, or as his "thorn in the flesh" was to Paul himself.

Remedies safer than wine are now known, and the attempt to inject a temperance discussion into the problem by asking whether I would repeat the advice fails to create a diversion.

Concerning a similar passage in the Old Testament the representative suggests that literal wine may not be meant but the "wine of inspiration." If so it must be very dangerous; for the passage begins: "It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine * * * lest they drink, and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted."

Mrs. Eddy, says her representative, "deprecates petitioning an All-knowing God for special favors." This is contrary to the teaching and practice both of Christ and his disciples. To seem to harmonize the Lord's prayer with her own teaching Mrs. Eddy has produced what deserves no better name than a travesty, as it practically eliminates every petition. Christian Scientists call it "a spiritual interpretation." The wine could have done no worse for Lemuel.

Of CRITICISMS of my quotations and statements there are few.

The anonymous quotation on the fly leaf of "Science and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Health," beginning, "I, I, I, I itself I, The inside and outside, the what and the why," was described as a characterization of the Infinite Ego. The representative declares that "No such explanation accompanies the text," and adds, "but even if this interpretation be correct, he (author of Absurd Paradox, etc.) does not tell us what conclusions he draws therefrom."

Why does *he* not reveal the true interpretation? Shall it forever remain uncertain? Is it revealed to Mrs. Eddy's private disciples only? It was not introduced to support a conclusion, but to bring forward the question of personal identity, to determine whether there is a human ego that suffers, feels, wills and acts. If it be not stark nonsense, that apostrophe to "I" is either a characterization of the Infinite Ego, or of some other ego. If it be the characterization of another ego than the Infinite, it undermines the foundation of Christian Science as expounded in the "Simple Logic, etc." If it is a characterization of the Infinite Ego, it is bald Pantheism, leaving no place for human personality and responsibility.

The representative complains that in the quotation beginning "Compared with the inspired wisdom and infinite meaning of the Word of Truth," Berkeley and others writers mentioned, "are * * * as Stygian night to the kindling dawn," I inserted after "Word of Truth" in brackets the title "Science and Health." The connection led to the belief that the "Word of Truth" referred to "Science and Health;" but if the reference is to the Bible it does not affect the result; for Mrs. Eddy declares that the sole author of "Science and Health" is God, and she but a "scribe echoing the harmonies of heaven in Metaphysics."

The Manual of services for Christian Science churches requires this address to be read, which has one word italicized:

"The canonical writings, together with the word of our textbook, * * * constitute a sermon undivorced from truth, uncontaminated and unfettered by human hypotheses, and *authorized* by Christ."

It is claimed by Mrs. Eddy that even the by-laws of the mother church in Boston were definitely inspired by God.

"The Rules and By-Laws in the Manual of The First Church of Christ, Scientist, Boston, originated not in solemn conclave as in ancient Sanhedrim. They were not arbitrary opinions nor dictatorial demands such as one person might impose on another.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"*They were impelled by a power not one's own,* were written at different dates, and as the occasion required." *

Leo XIII would not be allowed by the most ancient and venerable organization of which he is the head to make such claims, neither could the holy apostles or prophets claim more. The correction gives opportunity to emphasize the stupendous claims of this irresponsible medium of alleged special communication with the Infinite.

The representative charges against me a grave error in quotation:

"A quotation from Mrs. Eddy's writings, which he designates as drawn from 'elsewhere,' is an incorrect rendering from 'Miscellaneous Writings,' pp. 361-2. Here the word 'elucidates' has been changed to 'eliminates'—totally changing the sense of Mrs. Eddy's words. Owing to a certain similarity in the appearance of these printed words, and to the fact that they contain the same number of letters, I think this mistake must be ascribed to a typographical error."

A member of the Publication Committee of an institution not yet forty years old should certainly be acquainted with the authorized documents of his Church. The quotation was *not* from "Miscellaneous Writings," copyrighted in 1896, but from the *Christian Science Journal,* December, 1886, article first, entitled "Science and Philosophy," by Rev. Mary B. G. Eddy. The word in the original is "eliminates" and not "elucidates." No mistake was made.

Further, "elucidates" in the passage referred to seems strangely out of place. "He eliminates (elucidates) his own idea wherein principle and idea are not one—or God and man are one —and who could say which that one was?"

Either "eliminates" or "extirpates" or "mystifies" might be substituted for elucidates without making more or less sense; and the whole was introduced to show that Mrs. Eddy in that rhapsody ran, not into transcendentalism or mysticism, but into mere fog.

As these are all the criticisms attempted, it may be assumed that the other statements of fact and quotation are correct.

The SCRIPTURES quoted in "The Simple Logic, etc.," are in every case mutilated, misunderstood, or misapplied. These errors, apart from the subject, are so peculiar as to deserve preservation as curiosities. The writer endorses Mrs. Eddy's statement that

* 21st Edition Manual of the Mother Church. Extract from a letter in "Miscellaneous Writings" by Mary Baker G. Eddy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diet, dirt and exercise can neither help nor harm except as belief causes it, and remarks, "Concerning exercise, I find Mrs. Eddy's words wonderfully corroborated in I. Timothy, iv., 7-8."

Here follows the passage, of which the proxy gave only part:

> "But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness. For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."

All that men can do in the natural world if done without godliness profiteth but for a little time, but godliness has the promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come. It has no relation to what is called "exercise" for health's sake. What were the "old wives' fables" that were to be refused does not appear, but that dirt, diet and exercise can neither help nor harm, except as one thinks, might well be among the number.

To prove that one should not ask God specifically for anything, the representative says: "The warning of James must not be disregarded: 'Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss.'" Here he splits the sentence, improperly punctuates it, and wholly perverts the sense. The purpose was to teach disciples to ask for special favors of God from right motives, and to be used for right purposes. "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, *that ye may consume it upon your lusts.*"

The Sermon on the Mount is distorted by affirming that Christ showed that man is not dependent upon material remedies, and never taught sanitation. The proof he gives of this is, "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on." He forgot that the same sermon declared that "your Heavenly Father knoweth that *ye have need of these things.* But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you"—you shall have what is necessary to eat and to drink, and your body shall have something to wear.

These are examples of emergency logic. There is a remarkable similarity between them and the style of Brigham Young when Horace Greeley asked him how he could harmonize Polygamy with the command, "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife." Young replied, "He must not be a celibate; he must have one wife *at least!*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is an almost entire absence of LOGICAL REASONING, even where its forms are employed. This is an illustration:

"Darkness is not an entity or a reality, but merely the absence of light; black is not a color, but rather the negation of color. So disease is viewed in Christian Science as the absence or negation of health, and not as a positive quantity."

These analogies are not just. Health is a condition of or process in the human clothing of the spirit of man; so also is disease. Neither is a "positive quantity" that can be bottled up or weighed. Change the condition or obstruct the processes which naturally give ease in thinking, feeling, acting—otherwise health—and the result will be dis-ease.

That man cannot comprehend the process by which he sees, hears, touches, tastes and smells, is no reason why he should deny either the existence of spirit or body, or accept as Divine Wisdom the contradictory statements and inconsistent actions of Christian Scientists.

The representative distills the essence of unreason into the following:

"Humanly speaking, disease is distressingly real while it lasts; but when it is entirely gone, destroyed, by whatever means, where is its reality? It might be termed, paradoxically, a temporary reality; but, in point of fact, the real is the eternal and indestructible, and disease certainly does not belong to such a category."

Whoever supposed that when it is "entirely gone" it is real? Neither is health more than temporary reality; for "when it is 'destroyed' * * * where is its reality?"

Why, he asks, if there be any power in drugs, did not Christ use them. This is a constantly recurring question in Mrs. Eddy's works, but it is "logic" walking on one leg. How could a prophet or Divine teacher who uses natural means prove thereby that he had supernatural power? Christ might as well have been asked to calm the waves of the sea by pouring oil upon them.

"What authority is there," he asks, "for the statement that 'the disciples lost no patients,' or that 'those whom they healed suffered no relapses?' There was no record kept of these cases so far as we know."

Then, so far as we know, most of them might have relapsed. This is another instance of Christian Science healers' reading back their methods into the New Testament. *They* keep no records of failures or relapses.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The influence of Mrs. Eddy's personality and habit of mistaking disconnected assertions for logic, afflicts all her devotees. A few months is sufficient to make a marked change in the few who had formerly been capable of coherent and concentrated thought.

It having been reported that Mrs. Eddy resorted to anæsthetics to deaden the sense of pain when undergoing the extraction of a tooth, it became necessary to secure testimony from the dentist. Accordingly the following was printed in the *Christian Science Journal:*

"The following over Dr. Fletcher's own signature is also given *verbatim:*

"The story told by the Rev. Dr. Whitaker and others, to the effect that Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy called at my office in Concord, N. H., in great pain, and had a carious tooth extracted, requesting me to use a local anaesthetic before extracting the tooth, is incorrect. Mrs. Eddy did call at my office and had a troublesome tooth extracted. But it was not a carious tooth, neither was she in pain at the time. She did request me to extract the tooth, allowing me to use my own painless method for extracting teeth, which I had recommended.

"I shall take no further notice of inquiries on this subject.

"(Signed) JOHN M. FLETCHER.

"Concord, N. H., November 22, 1900."

With this Mrs. Eddy published the following attempt at the the vindication of her course:

"Bishop Berkeley and I agree that all is Mind. Then, consistently with this premise, the conclusion is, that if I employ a dental surgeon, and he believes that the extraction of a tooth is made easier by some application or means which he employs, and I object to the employment of this means, I have turned the dentist's mental protest against myself; he thinks I must suffer because his method is interfered with. Therefore, his mental force weighs against a painless operation, whereas it should be put into the same scale as mine, thus producing a painless operation as a logical result."

Mrs. Eddy's votaries received this, not only without laughter, but with awe!

The ESSENTIAL FALLACIES of Christian Science are in these passages:

"Christian Science, then, teaches that God is Spirit, or Mind. But if God is infinite and perfect, He must also be Infinite Good, and this Infinite Good is what we term Love. The idea of a God knowing good and evil, capable of love and hate, rewarding and punishing His children at will, gives place in Christian Science to a new concept.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'God is divine Principle, supreme incorporeal Being, Mind, Spirit, Soul, Life, Truth, Love.'

* * * * * * * * *

"If God is Spirit, and He made man in His image and likeness, then man must be spiritual, and must reflect God's nature, as the creature reflects the Creator. Everything, therefore, which seems unlike God, or Good, in man must be the result of some false belief, and cannot form a part of the real and indestructible Creation."

The writer and all who think with him are confused because they use terms without a fixed and rational meaning. "God created all *things;* therefore if *evil* exists, God, Infinite Good, must have created it." But evil is not a thing; neither is *good.* Righteousness is not a thing to be created, or unrighteousness.

Recently its most popular lecturer thus argued. In a manner most beguiling, yet authoritative, he said: "God is infinite intelligence and wisdom." This seemed solid ground. Thence he proceeded: "The one infinite mind." This also seemed solid.

Edging a little nearer his objective, and growing somewhat obscure in respect of the sense connection, but still keeping the word connection, and the sound connection, well to the front, he exclaimed: "This infinite mind includes all consciousness and continuity of life, and therefore is life."

Thus he had progressed from "God" to "intelligence," to "wisdom," to "mind," to "consciousness," to "life."

It was only one step further, and he exclaimed: "He is not only life, but hath ordained eternal life, and is the law of life and health to men."

A prominent citizen, who went at the request of a friend, reports that: "At this point nine-tenths of the lecturer's hearers, capable under any circumstances of becoming adherents, regarded the case as made out, and stopped thinking altogether. He had juggled 'God' and 'Health' into a sort of juxtaposition, and what more would you have?"

When Mrs. Eddy defines God "as divine Principle, supreme incorporeal Being, Mind, Spirit, Soul, Life, Truth, Love," she jumbles together the most incongruous ideas. Some are terms for the Essential Deity, others attributes or qualities. Righteousness, goodness, love, could not exist except as acts or qualities of a moral being. Decay in a tree or disease in a body is not moral evil, nor, considered as a part of the Universe, any kind of evil,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but a step in the universal and necessary change. If moral evil (that is, sin committed by a free, responsible being) exists, God is not responsible for it, only as he would be responsible for the creation of free beings. He could not cause a free being to become morally evil against that being's will. So that, unless all his creatures are to be machines, moral evil must be possible.

Mrs. Eddy tries to impale on the horns of a dilemma those who do not accept her notions; but there is no dilemma for any one who holds firmly that God is a moral being, knowing, loving and lovable, without limitations of space, power or wisdom. He has created man also a moral being, capable of knowing, loving, obeying and disobeying. All these inhere in his spirit. But his spirit is mysteriously related to the universe through a something, for the want of a better term, known as "body." This is taken cognizance of by the senses. Christianity and Philosophy alike speak of the body as the house, tabernacle, and the spirit, as the man. While God is everywhere and is Spirit, the spirit of man is distinct from that of God, and is a finite centre of consciousness, reason and will, clad, as Shakespeare describes it, "a muddy vesture of decay." Human bodies and the material universe of which the senses take cognizance are not spirit.

Aiming to show that the author of "Absurd Paradox" cannot understand Christian Science without practising it, the writer of the "Simple Logic of Christian Science" begins with the words in which Christ gave thanks to the Father because He had hidden these things from the wise and prudent and revealed them unto babes.

Of this passage he has misunderstood the meaning. Christ did not declare that his teachings could only be received by the ignorant and the incautious, and that literal infancy is its best preparation. It is those so self-sufficient as not to feel the need of Him he contrasted with the teachableness of the babe. The representative obviously confounds childlikeness with childishness. Both Christ and Paul addressed the "natural man" in the plane of reason, answered their questions, and proved the truth of their teachings *before* they were fully accepted.

The representative of Mrs. Eddy has a low opinion of the intellectual faculty. In the "Simple Logic of Christian Science" he declares it to be "mortal mind;" "mortal mind" he identifies with the "carnal mind." This, Paul says, is "enmity against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

God!" After this the authorized exponent declares that "the intellectual faculty is only another name for mortal mind."

The only phenomenon to explain in Christian Science is Mrs. Eddy and her bewildering effect upon those whom she attracts. Nothing could more effectually prepare the way for such enslavement than the disparagement of the intellectual faculty.

By the insufficient exercise of "the intellectual faculty" the representative of Christian Science has allowed himself to make several incredible ASSERTIONS.

He has said, "Christian Science has already healed virtually every disease known to the medical profession." Men rarely insert "virtually" into an affirmation, unless their object is to secure the effect of an unqualified assertion without taking the responsibility. In this case, with, or without, virtually the statement is untrue.

They have never cured a case of cirrhosis of the liver, nor of multiple sclerosis—a disease in which nodules are formed in the brain which destroy the nervous elements, nor an unmistakable case of that most distressing disease locomotor-ataxia, nor of general paresis of the insane, nor of organic dementia, nor of progressive muscular atrophy.

Another assertion to be taken *cum grano salis* is this:

> "The failures of Christian Science are relatively rare. A very high percentage of cures is effected."

Relatively to what? the number of patients, the failures of physicians, or of Dowie, Simpson, or the Mormons. "They turn over most surgical cases to surgeons." Their failures are numerous. The dead are silent; of the uncured living, some hope against hope, others have returned to medical and surgical treatment. Some of their failures are charged up to physicians called in just before death in order to secure a certificate; many, though they may be kept alive for days or weeks, have died because physicians have not been called till too late to restore them. Often physicians are sent for by those who, depending on Christian Science, had refused their aid. Their delays often render curable stages of disease incurable. Twenty-four hours' neglect may make a case of laryngeal diphtheria hopeless, or a short time cause an acute attack of Bright's disease to prove fatal or transform it into a chronic case when by prompt attention to diet or medicine this disaster might have been averted. When scandals arise the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bureau of Publication is always ready to take the testimony of the healers and disclaim responsibility.

There is no justification for the title of Christian Science. It is *unchristian* because it differs from Christ's teachings concerning God; man; prayer; the relations of the human spirit to its body; to the healing of disease; and to Christ's teachings concerning Himself. It is not scientific because its results are not uniform or ascertainable, and, such as they are, can be explained by natural causes whose existence disproves the theory of Christian Science. It is a web of half truths and whole errors, deftly woven by a woman subtle enough to deceive and entangle herself by isolating herself from all but her subordinates, dependants, flatterers and devotees.

An officer reported to his superior the name of a prisoner as Johnson and was answered, "I thought the name was Thomas." Said the officer, "'Thomas' is his name, but 'Johnson' is his Ananias." Presumptuous Superstition is the real name of this invention. Christian Science is a misnomer.

I began the study of this class of subjects from the scientific point of view, and soon found that all that the human race had learned is false if this fad is truth. When its religious phase was elaborated, I found it to be a most inconsistent fanaticism, since, while using natural and "material" means for all other ends, it rejects them for the preservation and restoration of health.

As President of the Board of Managers of the Seney Hospital in Brooklyn since its foundation, I have witnessed such miracles of surgery and medicine as would have caused the physicians and surgeons to be hanged by the pious Puritans of Massachusetts two centuries ago, had such mighty works been performed without explanation. And as one of the Managers of the State Hospitals of the Insane at Trenton and Morris Plains, I have seen the maniac whose screams and violent conduct had for many doleful nights and dismal days horrified those who loved him, and terrified those who essayed to restrain him, sink—under the magic of sulphonal, trional, or paraldehyde—into a sleep as quiet if not sweet as that of a babe. I have seen him in the morning, the spell broken, the blood less rapid, the voice less strident, and, in a few months, returning to his old self and to his home. I have seen the young girl, anæmic, and muttering in the stupor of melancholia, in six weeks respond to the blood-making elements

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of well-selected foods, to the tonics, the sedatives, the baths, the exercise prescribed, the light of reason returning in the very month prophesied by the Medical Director.

To "be out of one's senses" is a grievous affliction, to disparage the senses and the mental faculties which interpret their reports is a crime against human nature, and an imputation upon its Creator.

For when disease undermines and tissues waste, when the brain reels under stress of agonizing pain, there is demanded a Science which ages of research and experimentation have brought to the opening century—a Science understanding and respecting both the body and the mind, which employes as medicine what God has endowed with suitable properties and which enforces the regimen His order in nature and man requires.

Understanding, faith, and prayer have their place, but if blood gushes from a desperate wound, stay not to pray; except, indeed, in that swift appeal to God for help which a true worshipper instinctively breathes in dire extremity—but lose no time in applying the cautery to stanch the blood, the cordial to sustain the patient; and, if necessary, the opiate to preserve him in quietude, or the stimulant to aid his failing heart.

The deification of unreason called Christian Science cannot long survive the triumph of "mortal mind" over its Foundress. Mankind will not permanently adopt it, and her death, whether painless or painful, will "demonstrate" that "it is appointed unto man once to die," whatever his creed or character. Then another will be added to the interminable procession of meteors of fancy which the credulous have accepted as Truth.

J. M. BUCKLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANTICIPATIONS: AN EXPERIMENT IN PROPHECY.—IV.

BY H. G. WELLS.

VI. WAR.

In shaping anticipations of the future of war there arises a certain difficulty about the point of departure. One may either begin upon such broad issues as the preceding forecasts have opened, or one may set all that matter aside for a space, and, having regard chiefly to the continually more potent appliances physical science offers the soldier, may try to develop a general impression of theoretically thorough war. The latter course will be taken here.

The great change that is working itself out in warfare is the same change that is working itself out in the substance of the social fabric. In warfare this takes the form of the progressive supersession of the horse and the private soldier, and the obliteration of the old distinction between the *leaders,* who pranced in a conspicuously dangerous and encouraging way into the picturesque incidents of battle, and the *led,* who cheered and charged and filled the ditches and were slaughtered in a wholesale, dramatic manner.

The revolution that is in progress from the old war to a new war different in its entire nature from the old is marked, primarily, by the steady progress in range and efficiency of the rifle and of the field gun—more particularly of the rifle. The rifle develops persistently from a clumsy implement that any clown may learn to use in half a day toward a very intricate mechanism, easily put out of order and easily misused, but of the most extraordinary possibilities in the hands of men of courage, character and high intelligence. One can conceive it as provided in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the future with cross-thread, telescopic sights, the focussing of which, corrected by some ingenious use of hygroscopic material, might even find the range and so enable it to be used with assurance up to a mile or more. It will probably also take on some of the characters of the machine gun. It will be used either for single shots or to quiver and send a spray of almost simultaneous bullets out of a magazine evenly and certainly over any small area the rifleman thinks advisable.

It will probably be portable by one man, but there is no reason, with the possible exception of the bayonet tradition the demands of which may be met in other ways, why it should be the instrument of one sole man. It will just as probably be slung with its ammunition and equipment upon bicycle wheels, and be the common care of two or more associated soldiers. Equipped with such a weapon, even a single couple of marksmen, by reason of smokeless powder and carefully chosen cover, might make themselves practically invisible and capable of surprising, stopping and destroying a visible enemy in quite considerable numbers who blundered within a mile of them. And a series of such groups of marksmen, so arranged as to cover the arrival of reliefs, provisions and fresh ammunition from the rear, might hold positions of a vast extent, and a few thousands might hold a frontier.

The only really effective and final defeat such an attenuated force of marksmen could sustain would be from the slow and circumspect advance upon it of a similar force of superior marksmen creeping forward under cover of night or of smokeshells and fire, digging pits during the snatches of cessation obtained in this way, and so coming nearer and nearer and getting a completer and completer mastery of the ground, until the approach of reliefs, food and fresh ammunition ceased to be possible. Thereupon, there would be nothing for it but surrender or a bolt in the night to positions in the rear—a bolt that might be hotly followed if it was deferred too late.

Probably, between contiguous nations that have mastered the art of war, instead of the pouring clouds of cavalry of the old dispensation, this will be the opening phase of the struggle, a vast duel all along the frontier between groups of skilled marksmen, continually being relieved and refreshened from the rear. Probably for a time there will be no definite army here or there, no controllable battle, no Great General in the field at all. But,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

somewhere far in the rear, the central organizer will sit at the telephonic centre of his vast front, and he will strengthen here and feed there and watch—watch perpetually—the pressure, the incessant, remorseless pressure that is seeking to wear down his countervailing thrust. Behind the thin firing line that is actually engaged, the country for many miles will be rapidly cleared and devoted to the business of war. Big machines will be at work making the second, third and fourth lines of trenches that may be needed if presently the firing line is forced back, spreading out transverse paths for the swift, lateral movement of the cyclists who will be in perpetual alertness to relieve sudden local pressures. And all along those great motor roads our first Anticipations sketched, there will be a vast and rapid shifting to and fro of big, long range guns. These guns will probably be fought with the help of balloons, which will hang above the firing line all along the front, incessantly ascending and withdrawing.

It will be evident that such a warfare as this inevitable precision of gun and rifle forces upon humanity will become less and less dramatic as a whole, more and more as a whole a monstrous thrust and pressure of people against people. No dramatic little general, spouting his troops into the proper hysterics for charging, no prancing, merely brave officers, no reckless gallantry or invincible stubbornness of men will suffice.

The battalion commander will be replaced, in effect, by the organizer of the balloons and guns by which his few hundreds of splendid individuals will be guided and reinforced. In the place of hundreds and thousands of more or less drunken and untrained young men marching into battle, muddle headed, sentimental, dangerous and futile hobbledehoys, there will be thousands of sober men, braced up to their highest possibilities, intensely doing their best. For eight miles on either side of the firing lines —whose fire will probably never altogether die away while the war lasts—men will live and eat and sleep under the imminence of unanticipated death. Such will be the opening phase of the war that is speedily to come.

And behind the thin firing line on either side, a vast multitude of people will be at work. Indeed, the whole mass of the efficients in the state will have to be at work, and most of them will be simply at the same work or similar work to that done in peace time—only now as combatants upon the lines of communi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cation. The organized staffs of the road managements, now become a part of the military scheme, will be deporting women and children and feeble people, and bringing up supplies and supports. The doctors will be dropping from their civil duties into pre-appointed official places, directing the feeding and treatment of the shifting masses of people, and guarding the valuable manhood of the fighting apparatus most sedulously from disease. The engineers will be entrenching and bringing up a vast variety of complicated and ingenious apparatus, designed to surprise and inconvenience the enemy in novel ways. The dealers in food and clothing, the manufacturers of all sorts of necessary stuff, will be converted by the mere declaration of war into public servants.

The spontaneous traffic of the roads in peace will fall now into two streams; one of women and children coming, quietly and comfortably, out of danger; the other of men and material going up to the front. There will be no panics, no hardships, because everything will have been amply prearranged—we are dealing with an ideal state. Quietly and tremendously that state will have gripped its adversary and tightened its muscles—that is all.

Now, the strategy of this new sort of war, in its opening phase, will consist mainly in very rapid movements of guns and men behind that thin screen of marksmen, in order to deal some forcible blow, suddenly and unexpectedly to snatch at some position into which guns and men may be thrust to outflank and turn the advantage of the ground against some portion of the enemy's line. The game will be largely to crowd and crumple that line, to stretch it over an arc to the breaking point, to secure a position from which to shell and destroy its supports and provisions, and to capture or destroy its guns and apparatus. A factor of primary importance in this warfare, because of the importance of seeing the board, a factor which will be enormously stimulated to develop in the future, will be the aerial factor. Already we have seen the captive balloon as an incidental accessory of considerable importance, even in the wild country warfare of South Africa. But in the warfare that will go on in the highly organized European states of the opening century, the special military balloon used in conjunction with guns, conceivably of small calibre, but of enormous length and range, will play a part of primary importance.

These guns will be carried on vast mechanical carriages, pos-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sibly with wheels of such a size as will enable them to traverse almost all sorts of ground. The aeronauts, provided with large scale maps of the hostile country, will mark down to the gunners below the precise point upon which to direct their fire; and over hill and dale the shell will fly—ten miles, it may be—to its billet, camp, massing night attack, or advancing gun. Great multitudes of balloons will be the Argus eyes of the entire military organism, stalked eyes with a telephonic nerve in each stalk, and at night they will sweep the country with search-lights, and come soaring before the wind with hanging flares. Probably, they will be steerable. And, so far as the resources of the men on the ground go, the balloons will be invulnerable. The mere perforation of balloons which shot does them little harm; and the possibility of hitting a balloon that is drifting about at a practically unascertainable distance and height so precisely as to blow it to pieces with a timed shell, within the little time before it is able to give simple and precise instructions as to your range and position to the unseen gunners it directs, is certainly one of the most difficult and trying undertakings for an artillery-man that one can well imagine. I am inclined to think that these considerations against a successful attack on balloons from the ground will stimulate enterprise and invention enormously in the direction of dirigible aerial devices that can be fought. Few people, I fancy, who know the work of Langley, Lilienthal, Pilcher, Maxim and Chanute, but will be inclined to believe that long before the year 2000, A. D., probably before 1950, a successful aeroplane will have soared and come home safe and sound. Directly that is accomplished, the new invention will be most assuredly applied to war. This opening phase, therefore, of deadlocked lines of marksmen below will be accompanied by a desperate and finally decisive struggle for the command of the sky. They will lie warily in their shelter pits and see—. What will they see?

The nature of the things that will ultimately fight in the sky is a matter for curious speculation. We begin with the captive balloon. Against that the navigable balloon will presently operate. I am inclined to think the navigable balloon will be first attained by the use of a device already employed by nature in the swimming bladder of fishes. This is a closed gas bag, that can be contracted or expanded. If a gas bag of thin, strong, practically impervious substance could be enclosed in a net of closely inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laced fibres (interlaced, for example, on the pattern of the muscles of the bladder in mammals), the ends of these fibres might be wound and unwound, and the effect of contractibility attained. A row of such balloons hung over a long car, which was horizontally expanded into wings, would not only allow that car to rise and fall at will, but if the balloon at one end were contracted, that at the other end expanded and the intermediate ones allowed to assume intermediate conditions, the former end would drop, the expanded wings would be brought into a slanting condition over a smaller area of supporting air, and the whole apparatus would tend to glide downwards in that direction. The projection of a small vertical plane upon either side would make the gliding mass rotate in a descending spiral—and so we have all the elements of a controllable flight. Such an affair would be difficult to overset. It would be able to beat up even in a fair wind, and then it would be able to contract its bladders and fall down a long slant in any direction. From some such crude beginning a form like a soaring, elongated, flat-brimmed hat might grow, and the possibilities of adding an engine-driven screwtail are obvious enough.

Between flying machine and flying machine it will be a fight of hawks complicated by bullets and little shells. They will rush up and up to get the pitch of one another, until the aeronauts sob and sicken in the rarified air, and the blood comes to eyes and nails. The marksmen below will strain at last, eyes under hands, to see the circling battle that dwindles in the zenith. Then, perhaps, a wild adventurous dropping of one close beneath the other, an attempt to stoop, the sudden splutter of guns, a tilting up or down, a disengagement. What will have happened? One combatant, perhaps, will heel lamely earthward, dropping, dropping, with half its bladders burst or shot away, while the other circles down in pursuit. "What are they doing?" Our marksmen will snatch at their field-glasses, tremulously anxious. "Is that a white flag, or no?"—

Once the command of the air is obtained by one of the contending armies, the war must become a conflict between a seeing host and one that is blind. The victor in that aerial struggle will tower with pitilessly watchful eyes over his adversary, will concentrate his guns and all his strength unobserved, will mark all his adversary's roads and communications and sweep them with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sudden, incredible disasters of shot and shell. The moral effect of this predominance will be enormous. All over the losing country, not simply at his frontier, but everywhere, the victor will soar. Everybody everywhere will be perpetually and constantly looking up, with a sense of loss and insecurity, with a vague distress of painful anticipations. By day, the victor's aeroplanes will sweep down upon apparatus of all sorts in the adversaries' rear and will drop explosive and incendiary matters upon them, so that no apparatus or camp or shelter will any longer be safe. At night, his high floating search-lights will go to and fro, and discover and check every desperate attempt to relieve or feed the exhausted marksmen of the fighting line. The phase of tension will pass—the weakening opposition will give, and the war, from a state of mutual pressure and petty combat, will develop into the collapse of the defensive lines. A general advance will occur under the aerial van. With that advance the phase of indecisive contests will have ended and the second phase of the new war, the business of forcing submission, will begin. This should be more easy in the future even, than in the past, in spite of the fact that central governments are now more elusive and small bodies of rifle-armed guerillas far more formidable than ever before. It will probably be brought about in a civilized country by the seizure of the vital apparatus of the urban regions, the water supply, the generating stations for electricity (which will supply all the heat and warmth of the land), and the chief ways used in food distribution. Through these expedients, even while the formal war is still in progress, an irresistible pressure upon a local population will be possible; and it will be easy to subjugate or to create afresh local authorities who will secure the invader from any danger of a guerilla warfare upon his rear. Through that a very obdurate loser will be got down to submission area by area. With the destruction of its military apparatus and the prospective loss of its water and food supply, however, the defeated civilized state will probably be willing to seek terms, as a whole, and bring the war to a formal close.

In cases where instead of contiguous frontiers the combatants are separated by the sea, the aerial struggle will probably be preceded or accompanied by a struggle for the command of the sea. Of this warfare there have been many forecasts. In this, as in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the warfare of the coming time, imaginative foresight, a perpetual alteration of tactics, a perpetual production of unanticipated devices, will count enormously. Other things being equal, victory will rest with the force mentally most active. What type of ship may chance to be prevalent when the great naval war comes is hard guessing; but I incline to think that the naval architects of the ablest peoples will concentrate more and more upon speed and upon range and penetration and above all upon precision of fire. I seem to see a light type of ironclad, armored thickly only over its engines and magazines, murderously equipped and with a ram, as alert and deadly as a striking snake. In the battles of the open she will have little to fear from the slow, fumbling treacheries of the submarine. She will take as little heed of the chance of a torpedo as a barefooted man does of a needle in his path. Unless I know nothing of my own blood, the English and Americans will prefer to catch their enemies in ugly weather, or at night, and then they will fight to ram. The struggle on the high seas between any two naval powers (except, perhaps, the English and Americans, who have both unparalleled opportunities for coaling), will not last more than a week or so. One force or the other will be destroyed at sea, driven into its ports and blockaded there, or cut off from its supply of coal (or other force generator), and hunted down to fight or surrender. An inferior fleet that tries to keep elusively at sea, will always find a superior fleet between itself and coal, and will either have to fight at once or be shot into surrender as it lies helpless on the water. Some commerce-destroying enterprise on the part of the loser may go on, but I think the possibilities of that sort of thing are greatly exaggerated. The world grows smaller and smaller, the telegraph and telephone go everywhere, wireless telegraphy opens wider and wider possibilities to the imagination, and how the commerce-destroyer is to go on for long without being marked down, headed off, cut off from coal and forced to fight or surrender, I do not see. The commerce-destroyer will have a very short run. It will have to be an exceptionally good and costly ship, in the first place. It will be finally sunk or captured; and altogether I do not see how that sort of thing will pay when once the command of the sea is assured. A few weeks will carry the effective frontier of the stronger power up to the coast line of the weaker, and permit of the secure resumption of the overseas trade

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the former. Then will open a second phase of naval warfare, in which the submarine may play a larger part.

I must confess that my imagination, in spite of spurring, refuses to see any sort of submarine doing anything but suffocate its crew and founder at sea. It must involve physical inconvenience of the most demoralizing sort simply to be in one for any length of time. Imagine yourself in one, that has ventured a few miles out of port. Imagine that you have headache and nausea, and that some such ship as the *Viper* is flashing itself and its search-lights about whenever you come up to the surface, and promptly tearing down on your descending bubbles with a ram, perhaps trailing a tail of grapples or a net as well. You may, of course, throw out a torpedo or so—with as much chance of hitting vitally as you would have if you were blindfolded, turned round three times and told to fire revolver shots at a charging elephant. The possibility of sweeping for a submarine with a seine would be vividly present in the minds of a submarine crew. If you are near shore, you will probably be near rocks—an unpleasant complication in a hurried dive. Probably there would very soon be boats out, too, seeking with a machine gun or a pom-pom for a chance at your occasionally emergent conning tower. In no way can a submarine be more than purblind; it will be, in fact, practically blind. It will shut its eyes to charge; it will always be shutting its eyes. Given a derelict ironclad on a still night, within sight of land, a carefully handled submarine might succeed in groping its way to it and destroying it; but then it would be much better to attack such a vessel and capture it boldly with a few desperate men on a tug. At the utmost, the submarine will be used in narrow waters, in rivers, or to fluster or destroy ships in harbor. That is to say, it will simply be an added power in the hands of the nation that is predominant at sea. And even then it can be merely destructive, while a sane and high-spirited fighter will always be dissatisfied if, with an indisputable superiority of force, he fails to take.

The military advantages of the command of the sea will probably be greater in the future than they have been in the past. A fleet with aerial supports would be able to descend upon any portion of the adversary's coast it chose, and to dominate the country inland for several miles with its gun fire. All the enemy's seacoast towns would be at its mercy. It would be able to effect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

landings and send raids of cyclist marksmen inward, whenever a weak point was discovered. Landings will be enormously easier than they have ever been before Once a wedge of marksmen has been driven inland they would have all the military advantages of the defense, when it came to eject them. They might, for example, encircle and block some fortified post and force costly and disastrous attempts to relieve it. The defensive country would stand at bay, tethered against any effective counter blow, keeping guns, supplies and men in perpetual and distressing movement to and fro along its sea frontiers. Its soldiers would get uncertain rest, irregular feeding, unhealthy conditions of all sorts in hastily made camps. The attacking fleet would divide and reunite, break up and vanish, amazingly reappear. The longer the defender's coast, the more wretched his lot. Never before in the world's history was the command of the sea worth what it is now. But the command of the sea is, after all, like military predominance on land, to be insured only by superiority of equipment in the hands of a certain type of man, a type of man that it becomes more and more impossible to improvise.

All this elaboration of warfare lengthens the scale between theoretical efficiency and absolute unpreparedness. In practice the fight will never be between equal sides, but between the more efficient and the less efficient, between the more inventive and the more traditional. While the victors, disciplined and grimly intent, full of the sombre, yet glorious delight of a grave thing well done, will be fighting like one great national body without shouting or confusion, the losers will be taking that pitiless exposure of helplessness in such a manner as their national culture and character may determine. War for the losing side will be an unspeakably pitiable business. There will be, first of all, the coming of the war, the wave of excitement, the belligerent shouting of the unemployed inefficients, the flag waving, the secret doubts, the eagerness for hopeful news, the impatience of the warning voice. I seem to see, almost as if he were symbolic, the gray old general, the general who learned his art of war away in the vanished nineteenth century, the gray old general with his epaulettes and decorations, his uniform that has still its historical value, his spurs and his sword, riding along on his obsolete horse, by the side of his doomed column. Above all things he is a gentleman. And the column looks at him lovingly with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its countless boys' faces; and the boys' eyes are infinitely trustful, for he has won battles in the old time. They will believe in him to the end. They have been brought up in their schools to believe in him and his class, their mothers have mingled respect for the gentlefolk with the simple doctrines of their faith; their first lesson on entering the army was the salute. So the gray general rides, and his doomed columns march by in this vision that haunts my mind.

I cannot foresee what such a force will attempt to do against modern weapons. Nothing can happen but the needless and most wasteful and pitiful killing of these poor lads who make up the infantry battalions, the main mass of all the European armies of to-day, whenever they come against a sanely organized army. Yet, in the ampler prospect, even this haunting tragedy of innumerable, avoidable deaths is but an incidental thing. The ampler fact, after all, is the inexorable tendency in all this to make a soldier a skilled and educated man and to link him in sympathy and organization with the engineer and the doctor and all the continually developing mass of scientifically educated men—that new social organism which the advance of mechanism is producing. The warfare of the coming time will really be won in schools and colleges and universities wherever men write and read and talk together. The nation that produces, in the near future, the largest proportional development of educated and intelligent engineers, agriculturists, doctors, schoolmasters, professional soldiers, and intellectually active people of all sorts; the nation that most resolutely picks over, educates, sterilizes, exports or poisons its People of the Abyss; the nation that succeeds most subtly in checking gambling and the moral decay of women and homes that gambling inevitably entails; the nation that, by wise interventions, death duties and the like, contrives to expropriate and extinguish incompetent families, while leaving individual ambitions free; the nation, in a word, that turns the greatest proportion of its irresponsible adiposity into social muscle will certainly be the nation that will be the most powerful in warfare, will certainly be the ascendant or dominant nation before the year 2000. In the long run, no heroism and no accidents can alter that. No flag waving, no Patriotic Leagues, no visiting of essentially petty Imperial Personages hither and thither, no smashing of windows of outspoken people,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nor seizures of papers and books, will arrest the march of national defeat. And this issue is already so plain and simple, the alternatives are becoming so pitilessly clear, that even in the stupidest court and the stupidest constituencies it must presently begin in some dim way to be felt. A time will come when so many people will see this issue clearly that it will affect gravely both political and social life. The patriotic party will be forced to become an efficiency party, in profession at least, to stimulate and organize the educational and social development that may at last bring even patriotism under control. The rulers of the gray, the democratic politician and the democratic monarch, will be forced year by year by the very nature of things to promote the segregations of colors within the gray, to foster the power that will finally supersede democracy altogether, the power of the scientifically educated, disciplined specialist, the power of the thing that is provably right.

I propose at last, in these Anticipations, to give some reasons for looking towards one particular nation which will, I believe, upon the assumptions here made first get itself organized and equipped upon the new lines and emerge to predominance throughout the world during the next century—so great is my prophetic temerity! But before that is done a certain body of considerations affecting language and the sentiment of nationality and, indeed, the very meaning of "nation" will have to be dealt with. These considerations will constitute the matter of the paper immediately following this. H. G. WELLS.

(To be continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON REFORM IN WOMEN'S DRESS.

BY PRINCESS YSENBURG.

"LIGHT, more light," were the last words of Goethe. Could light be poured into the darkness which surrounds the question of women's dress in its relations to the health and happiness of womankind, it would bring about a speedy and far-reaching reformation.

Until the present day fashion has ignored the ill effects resulting to her followers from strict adherence to her rule which injures their health, and the health of the whole of civilized humanity through them. It has been reserved for the end of the nineteenth century to bring about a change in the view of the world on the subject of Women's Dress; and the question has been raised as to whether it would not be better for humanity in general if women were to dress rationally according to the rules of health, instead of dressing according to the variable dictates of dressmakers, whose only object is to discover something new and who are indifferent to everything but the task of filling their own pockets. With this laudable purpose they have been in a manner reintroducing those old German instruments of torture, which are to be seen in the old castle of Nuremberg. Which of my readers who has been to Bayreuth has not also visited Nuremberg and taken an interest in those horrible relics of a barbarous age? Perhaps many have shuddered when looking at the "Giserne Jungfrau," who embraced her victims and squeezed them to death!

Does it not remind you of our modern torture instruments called "corsets"? Are not corsets the most unhealthy article of dress you can find, and does it not stand to reason that they must be the ruin of their unfortunate wearer's health, tightened

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as they are to their smallest possible limit? One of our celebrated medical authorities in Berlin, Dr. Gulenburg, says on the subject as follows: "The criticisms we make on the dress of the modern woman are on the whole most justified, and are to be classified into three divisions: First, the hygienic and medical; second, the universal, and, third, the practical."

Let us first look at the universal point of view, which is apt to appeal to women's sense of beauty and find its way to their understanding quicker than the hygienic and practical point of view, though all these points are in close connection and corroboration. What is the first fault to be found in the modern woman's dress from a universal point of view? Let us leave for the present those faults which are most evident: the headgear, covering for the feet, length of the walking skirt, etc., and let us concentrate our attention on the waist. The biggest fault of the dress of our modern woman is that it is moving the waist out of the place where nature intended it to be, and forcing it lower down, compressing the organs in a manner that must have the worst effect on their development. In another part of Dr. Gulenburg's article he says that the unnatural compression of the waist is causing ænemia—the special complaint of our time—hindering the circulation of the blood, creating heart disease and all the evils that follow in its train. Does not that seem a rather serious consequence of an irrational way of dressing, and is it not most important to find some more healthy mode of dress to save humanity from further suffering?

It is here that the reform of woman's dress must begin. What we require is a bodice or blouse which will give the whole trunk of the body sufficient room in which to come to its full natural development, a development that is in my opinion a far more beautiful sight than an unnaturally small waist, which gives its owner the appearance of a half-cut tree. The bodice which would fulfill this condition is one that is suspended from the shoulders by wide straps, thus making the whole body participate in the burden of the dress. This is an eminently rational costume.

Another instrument of torture worn as an article of dress is the high collar, against which our doctors and specialists indignantly cry out. The oculist condemns it on the ground that it is a source of danger to the eyes, pressing upon the eye nerves and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

occasioning various ailments from which these valuable organs suffer.

It is condemned by the throat specialist as swathing the throat and rendering it susceptible to changes of temperature. The throat in their view should be left open as much as possible to the air, which exercises a hardening and strengthening influence. Regarding the high collar from the point of comfort, it makes it almost impossible for us to turn our heads. I am reminded of another form of torture used in the Netherlands to punish garrulity, used also to punish women for quarrelsomeness. There was a sort of iron cage in the market-place where they had to stand from sunrise to sunset, the cynosure of all eyes. They sat facing each other in close proximity, their necks compressed within high iron collars. Though the modern collars are made of softer stuff, they are little more comfortable to the wearer. Let us then put them away, and take with a good grace to the turned down ones, such as are worn by our marines and colonial troops.

What do you say to the trailing skirts? Are they not in a different way another danger to the general health? Is it not absurd to walk about trailing behind you a bit of stuff which sweeps the streets, performing the office of an unpaid scavenger, and bringing illness and death into your houses by means of all the mud you have swept off the streets and all the horrible bacilli finding their way to your homes? Unfortunately, a good many of our ladies like the trailing skirt, because it makes them look taller and more stately, giving an elegant shape to the figure. That is certainly true, and I am quite willing to let it have its due. I only want to put it in its place, and that is—the drawing-room.

So far I have only shown the dangers the trailing skirt entails on the wearer, but there are more dangers lurking in the background. I think of the poor servants whose duty it is to clean them. Are they not obliged to inhale all the dust stored up in these garments, making themselves liable to all sorts of illnesses, and to spread them? I should think the trailing skirts need the most speedy reform!

At a ball the other day I was struck by a new extravagance of fashion, which made me think of the necessity for reform in ball dresses. My reader is sure to know what I mean—skirts unduly long in front. Is it not dangerous in the highest de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gree, this dancing with a train in front of your feet? You enter a ballroom a joyous girl, beaming all over with smiles at the prospect of an enjoyable night, and at the first steps your partner treads on your front trail, falls down with you, and you may have received lifelong injuries. Is not this newest folly of fashion more insane even than the trailing skirt itself? It has not even the excuse of *fin de siècle.*

This dangerous outgrowth of fashion must be abolished with as little delay as possible, and I think I have found a means of doing away with it! Would it not be simple to put a remark on the invitation such as: "Ladies are requested to wear dresses not reaching below the instep in front"?

Young ladies who are the leaders of fashion by right of rank, wealth and beauty, I appeal to you personally to take up this special lead! Have the courage to walk in the streets of your cities in a skirt reaching to the ankles; show off your pretty feet; and in a short time all women will follow your example, and the trailing skirt will have been expelled like the "crinoline" and the not less abominable "tournure" of former times.

Even though the celebrated Berlin professor is willing to overlook other details of necessary reforms I do not feel inclined to draw the line at the waist, and I beg my reader with her mind's eye to follow me down to the feet of my supposed model. Here are excessively small shoes pinching the feet supported by Louis Quinze heels. We all know how very injurious these heels are to the spine. They throw the weight of the body to the middle of the foot, instead of supporting it at the natural place. Here the only proper thing is worn by the practical Englishwoman, who wears broad, low heels, enabling her to walk miles and miles, to do mountaineering and join in every sport which the Louis Quinze heels simply forbid to their disciples. There are also india-rubber soles and heels which are worn to break the force of the step. The newest invention of this kind has been made quite recently in England and is going to be tried by English postmen. This invention consists in boots, the heels of which have springs. The idea is the same as in the above-mentioned india-rubber heels, but it has many more advantages. Besides the feeling of walking on cushions, the spring heels are said to allow the air to penetrate to the feet, thus excluding foot soreness even after long walks. It stands to reason

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the pointed shoes ought to make way for broader ones, at least for walking purposes.

Now allow me to take a leap upwards again, and say a few words on the subject of veils. I am afraid I must find fault with them, too, from a health standpoint. Can it be good for the eyes, for instance, to have a thick veil before them, covered with all sorts of big, dark points, or long-drawn snakes crossing your face, coming between your eyes and the object of their contemplation? Does it not stand to reason, too, that your eyes become irritated by such treatment and that you run the risk of seriously injuring them? In summer veils are a nuisance, making one feel hotter than necessary, and in winter you think they preserve you from the cold. If you think so, I am sorry to have to destroy that illusion. On the contrary, they imprison your breath. It freezes to ice on your face, and you are in danger of having your nose frozen. I am sorry to say I have personally had the experience during the recent cold weather, so that I am sure it is much better and healthier to allow the air to flow freely round your face, hardening it against the influences of temperature.

I resume: The leading idea of reform in woman's dress is that every garment ought to fit according to the natural lines of the figure, without any impediment, without pinching or exclusion of free air that is supposed to penetrate as freely as possible through the clothing. I am afraid that elegance will be the sufferer for some time to come; for the medical celebrities, who are thinking only of the practical side and wishing to give relief to their patients suffering through their mode of dressing, leave it to those whose profession it is to think how to introduce their planned reforms into practical use. Yet this form of suffering of elegance will only wear so long as fashion ignores those reformatory views. If the leaders of fashion would take the reform of woman's dress in hand, and go in boldly for it, breaking with the traditions of high collars and pinched waists, Louis Quinze heels, veils, etc., the dawn of the reformed woman's dress would quickly come, the scale would turn in accordance, and the fashion of to-day would be scorned by those who are now its warmest followers and adorers.

MARY PRINCESS YSENBURG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAWTHORN AND LAVENDER:

SONGS AND MADRIGALS. PART III.

BY W. E. HENLEY.

ONLY a freakish wisp of hair?—
Nay, but its wildest, its most trivial whorl
Stands for a slim, enamoured, sweet-fleshed girl!
And so, a tangle of dream and charm and fun,
Its every crook a promise and a snare,
Its every dowle, or genially gadding
Or resolutely curled,
Heartening and madding,
Impales a novel and peculiar world
Of right, essential fantasies,
And shining acts as yet undone,
But in these high, romantic days
Soon, soon to ask our sovran Lord, the Sun,
For countenance and praise,
As of the best his storying eye hath seen,
And his vast memory can parallel,
Among the darling victories—
Beneficent, beautiful, inexpressible—
Of life on time!—
Yet have they flashed and been
In millions, since 'twas his to bring
The heaven-creating Spring,
An angel of adventure and delight,
In all her beauty and all her might and worth,
Home to the citizens of this good, green earth,
To fill them full of joy and pride and spright . . . .

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Poor souls—they have but time and place
To play their transient little play,
And sing their singular little song,
Ere they are rushed away
Into the antient, undisclosing Night;
And none is left to tell of the fair eyes
That filled them with God's grace,
And turned the iron skies to skies of gold!
None; but the sweetest She herself grows old—
Grows old, and dies;
And, but for such a lovely snatch of hair
As this, none—none could guess, or know
That She was kind and fair,
And He had nights and days beyond compare—
How many dusty and silent years ago!

I send you roses—red, like love,
  And white, like death, sweet friend:
Born in your bosom to rejoice,
  Languish, and pine, and end.

If the white roses tell of death,
  Let the red roses mend
The talk with true stories of love
  Unchanging to the end.

Red and white roses, love and death—
  What else is left to send?
For what is life but love, the means,
  And death, dear heart, the end?

When, in what other life,
Where in what old spent star,
Systems ago, dead vastitudes afar,
Were we two bird and bough, or man and wife?
Or wave and spar?
Or I the beating sea, and you the bar
On which it breaks? I know not, I!
But this, O this, my very dear, I know:
Your voice awakes old echoes in my heart;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And things I say to you now are said once more;
And, sweet, when we two part
I feel I have seen you falter and linger so,
So hesitate, and turn, and cling—yet go,
As once in some immemorable Before,
Once on some fortunate yet thrice-blasted shore . . . .
Was it for good?
O, these poor eyes are wet;
And yet, O, yet,
Now it comes back, I would not, if I could,
Forget.

June, and a warm, sweet rain;
  June, and the call of a bird:
To a lover in pain
  What lovelier word?

Two of each other fain
  Happily heart on heart;
So in the wind and rain
  Spring bears his part!

O, to be heart on heart
  Out in the warm June rain,
God with us from the start,
  And no more pain!

Silence, loneliness, darkness
  These and of these my fill
While God in the rush of Maytide
  Without is working His will.

Without are the wind and the wall-flowers,
  The leaves and the nests and the rain,
And in all of them God is making
  His beautiful purpose plain.

But I wait in a horror of strangeness—
  A tool on His workshop floor,
Worn to the butt, and banished
  His hand for evermore.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Shoreham River, hurrying down
To the live sea,
By working, marrying, breeding Shoreham Town,
Breaking the sunset's wistful and solemn dream,
An old, black rotter of a boat
Past service to the labouring, tumbling flote,
Lay stranded in mid-stream:
With a horrid list,
A frightening lapse from the line,
That made me think of legs and a broken spine:
Soon, all too soon,
Ungainly and forlorn to lie
Full in the eye
Of the cynical, discomfortable moon
That, as I looked, stared from the fading sky,
A clown's face flour'd for work. And bye-and-bye
The wide-winged sunset wanned and waned;
The lean night-wind crept westward, chilling and sighing;
The poor old hulk remained,
Stuck helpless in mid-ebb. And I knew why—
Why, as I looked, my heart felt crying.
For, as I looked, the good green earth seemed dying—
Dying or dead;
And, as I looked on the old beast, I said:
"Dear God, it's I!"

W. E. HENLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME ANOMALIES OF THE SHORT STORY.

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

THE interesting experiment of one of our great publishing houses in putting out serially several volumes of short stories*, with the hope that a courageous persistence may overcome the popular indifference to such collections when severally administered, suggests some questions as to this eldest form of fiction which I should like to ask the reader's patience with. I do not know that I shall be able to answer them, or that I shall try to do so; the vitality of a question that is answered seems to exhale in the event; it palpitates no longer; curiosity flutters away from the faded flower, which is fit then only to be folded away in the *hortus siccus* of accomplished facts. In view of this I may wish merely to state the problems and leave them for the reader's solution, or more amusingly, for his mystification.

I.

One of the most amusing questions concerning the short story is why a form which is singly so attractive that every one likes to read a short story when he finds it alone is collectively so repellant as it is said to be. Before now I have imagined the case to be somewhat the same as that of a number of pleasant people who are most acceptable as separate householders, but who lose caste and cease to be desirable acquaintances when gathered into a boarding-house. Yet the case is not the same quite, for we see that the short story where it is ranged with others of its species within the covers of a magazine is so welcome that the editor thinks his number the more brilliant the more short story writers he can call about his board, or under the roof of his *pension*. Here the boarding-house analogy breaks, breaks so

*Harper's Portrait Collection of Short Stories. Harper & Brothers: New York.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

signally that I was lately moved to ask a distinguished editor why a book of short stories usually failed and a magazine usually succeeded because of them. He answered gaily that the short stories in most books of them were bad; that where they were good, they went; and he alleged several well-known instances in which books of prime short stories had a great vogue. He was so handsomely interested in my inquiry that I could not well say I thought some of the short stories which he had boasted in his last number were indifferent good, and yet, as he allowed, had mainly helped sell it. I had in mind many books of short stories of the first excellence which had failed as decidedly as those others had succeeded, for no reason that I could see; possibly there is really no reason in any literary success or failure that can be predicated, or applied in another case.

I could name these books, if it would serve any purpose, but, in my doubt, I will leave the reader to think of them, for I believe that his indolence or intellectual reluctance is largely to blame for the failure of good books of short stories. He is commonly so averse to any imaginative exertion that he finds it a hardship to respond to that peculiar demand which a book of good short stories makes upon him. He can read one good short story in a magazine with refreshment, and a pleasant sense of excitement, in the sort of spur it gives to his own constructive faculty. But if this is repeated in ten or twenty stories, he becomes fluttered and exhausted by the draft upon his energies; whereas a continuous fiction of the same quantity acts as an agreeable sedative. A condition that the short story tacitly makes with the reader, through its limitations, is that he shall subjectively fill in the details and carry out the scheme which in its small dimensions the story can only suggest; and the greater number of readers find this too much for their feeble powers, while they cannot resist the incitement to attempt it.

My theory does not wholly account for the fact (no theory wholly accounts for any fact), and I own that the same objections would lie from the reader against a number of short stories in a magazine. But it may be that the effect is not the same in the magazine because of the variety in the authorship, and because it would be impossibly jolting to read all the short stories in a magazine seriatim. On the other hand, the identity of authorship gives a continuity of attraction to the short stories

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a book which forms that exhausting strain upon the imagination of the involuntary co-partner.

II.

Then, what is the solution as to the form of publication for short stories, since people do not object to them singly but collectively, and not in variety, but in identity of authorship? Are they to be printed only in the magazines, or are they to be collected in volumes combining a variety of authorship? Rather, I could wish, it might be found feasible to purvey them in some pretty shape where each would appeal singly to the reader and would not exhaust him in the subjective after-work required of him. In this event many short stories now cramped into undue limits by the editorial exigencies of the magazines might expand to greater length and breadth, and without ceasing to be each a short story might not make so heavy a demand upon the subliminal forces of the reader.

If any one were to say that all this was a little fantastic, I should not contradict him; but I hope there is some reason in it, if reason can help the short story to greater favor, for it is a form which I have great pleasure in as a reader, and pride in as an American. If we have not excelled all other moderns in it, we have certainly excelled in it; possibly because we are in the period of our literary development which corresponds to that of other peoples when the short story pre-eminently flourished among them. But when one has said a thing like this it immediately accuses one of loose and inaccurate statement, and requires one to refine upon it, either for one's own peace of conscience or for one's safety from the thoughtful reader. I am not much afraid of that sort of reader, for he is very rare, but I do like to know myself what I mean, if I mean anything in particular.

In this instance I am obliged to ask myself whether our literary development can be recognized separately from that of the whole English speaking world. I think it can, though, as I am always saying, American literature is merely a condition of English literature. In some sense every European literature is a condition of some other European literature, yet the impulse in each eventuates, if it does not originate (if I may be permitted the apparent tautology) indigenously. A younger lit-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erature will choose, by a sort of natural selection, some things for assimilation from an elder literature, for no more apparent reason than it will reject other things, and it will transform them in the process so that it will give them the effect of indigeneity. The story among the Italians, who called it the *novella,* and supplied us with the name devoted solely among us to fiction of epical magnitude, refined indefinitely upon the Greek romance, if it derived from that; it retrenched itself in scope, and enlarged itself in the variety of its types. But still these remained types, and they remained types with the French imitators of the Italian novella. It was not till the Spaniards borrowed the form of the novella and transplanted it to their racier soil that it began to bear character, and to fruit in the richness of their picaresque fiction. When the English borrowed it they adapted it, in the metrical tales of Chaucer, to the genius of their nation, which was then both poetical and humorous. Here it was full of character, too, and more and more personality began to enlarge the bounds of the conventional types and to imbue fresh ones. But in so far as the novella was studied in the Italian sources, the French, Spanish and English literatures were conditions of Italian literature as distinctly, though, of course, not so thoroughly, as American literature is a condition of English literature. Each borrower gave a national cast to the thing borrowed, and that is what has happened with us, in the full measure that our nationality has differenced itself from the English.

Whatever truth there is in all this, and I will confess that a good deal of it seems to me hardy conjecture, rather favors my position that we are in some such period of our literary development as those other peoples when the short story flourished among them. Or, if I restrict our claim I may safely claim that they abundantly had the novella when they had not the novel at all, and we now abundantly have the novella, while we have the novel only subordinately and of at least no such quantitative importance as the English, French, Spanish, Norwegians, Russians, and some others of our esteemed contemporaries, not to name the Italians. We surpass the Germans, who, like ourselves, have as distinctly excelled in the modern novella as they have fallen short in the novel. Or, if I may not quite say this, I will make bold to say that I can think of many German novelle that I should like to read again, but scarcely one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

German novel; and I could honestly say the same of American novelle, though not of American novels.

III.

The abeyance, not to say the desuetude, that the novella fell into for several centuries is very curious, and fully as remarkable as the modern rise of the short story. It began to prevail in the dramatic form, for a play is a short story put on the stage; it may have satisfied in that form the early love of it, and it has continued to please in that form; but in its original shape it quite vanished, unless we consider the little studies and sketches and allegories of the Spectator, and Tatler, and Idler, and Rambler, and their imitations on the continent, as guises of the novella. The germ of the modern short story may have survived in these, or in the metrical form of the novella which appeared in Chaucer and never wholly disappeared. With Crabbe the novella became as distinctly the short story as it has become in the hands of Miss Wilkins. But it was not till our time that its great merit as a form was felt, for until our time so great work was never done with it. I remind myself of Boccaccio, and of the Arabian Nights, without the wish to hedge from my bold stand. They are all elemental; compared with some finer modern work which deepens inward immeasurably, they are all of their superficial limits. They amuse, but they do not hold the mind, and stamp it with large and profound impressions.

An Occidental cannot judge the literary quality of the Eastern tales; but I will own my suspicion that the perfection of the Italian work is philological rather than artistic, while the web woven by Mr. James or Miss Jewett, by Kielland or Björnson, by Maupassant, by Palacio Valdés, by Giovanni Verga, by Tourguénief, in one of those little frames seems to me of an exquisite color and texture and of an entire literary preciousness, not only as regards the diction, but as regards those more intangible graces of form, those virtues of truth and reality and those lasting significances which distinguish the masterpiece.

The novella has in fact been carried so far in the short story that it might be asked whether it had not left the novel behind, as to perfection of form; though one might not like to affirm this. Yet there have been but few modern fictions of the novel's dimensions which have the beauty of form many a novella em-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bodies. Is this because it is easier to give form in the small than in the large, or only because it is easier to hide formlessness? It is easier to give form in the novella than in the novel, because the design of less scope can be more definite, and because the persons and facts are fewer, and each can be more carefully treated. But on the other hand the slightest error in execution shows more in the small than in the large, and a fault of conception is more evident. The novella must be clearly imagined, above all things, for there is no room in it for those felicities of characterization or comment by which the artist of faltering design saves himself in the novel.

IV.

The question as to where the short story distinguishes itself from the anecdote is of the same nature as that which concerns the bound set between it and the novel. In both cases the difference of the novella is in the motive, or the origination. The anecdote is too palpably simple and single to be regarded as a novella, though there is now and then a novella like *"The Father,"* by Björnson, which is of the actual brevity of the anecdote, but which, when released in the reader's consciousness, expands to dramatic dimensions impossible to the anecdote. Many anecdotes have come down from antiquity, but not, I believe, one short story, at least in prose; and the Italians, if they did not invent the story, gave us something most sensibly distinguishable from the classic anecdote in the novella. The anecdote offers an illustration of character, or records a moment of action; the novella embodies a drama and develops a type.

It is not quite so clear as to when and where a piece of fiction ceases to be a novella and becomes a novel. The frontiers are so vague that one is obliged to recognize a middle species, or rather a middle magnitude, which paradoxically, but necessarily enough, we call the novelette. First we have the short story or novella, then we have the long story or novel, and between these we have the novelette, which is in name a little short story longer than a short story. We may realize them physically if we will adopt the magazine parlance and speak of the novella as a one-number story, of the novel as a serial, and of the novelette as a two-number or a three-number story; if it passes the three-number limit it seems to become a novel. As a two-number or three-number story it is the despair of editors and publishers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The interest of so brief a serial will not mount sufficiently to carry strongly over from month to month; when the tale is completed it will not make a book which the Trade (inexorable force!) cares to handle. It is therefore still awaiting its authoritative avatar, which it will be some one's prosperity and glory to imagine; for in the novelette are possibilities for fiction as yet scarcely divined.

The novelette can have almost as perfect form as the novella. In fact the novel has form in the measure that it approaches the novelette; and some of the most symmetrical modern novels are scarcely more than novelettes, like Tourguénief's "Dmitri Rudine," or his "Smoke," or "Spring Floods." "The Vicar of Wakefield," the father of the modern novel, is scarcely more than a novelette, and I have sometimes fancied, but no doubt vainly, that the ultimated novel might be of the dimensions of "Hamlet." If any one should say there was not room in "Hamlet" for the character and incident requisite in a novel I should be ready to answer that there seemed a good deal of both in "Hamlet."

But no doubt there are other reasons why the novel should not finally be of the length of "Hamlet," and I must not let my enthusiasm for the novelette carry me too far, or, rather, bring me up too short. I am disposed to dwell upon it, I suppose, because it has not yet shared the favor which the novella and the novel have enjoyed, and because until somebody invents a way for it to the public it cannot prosper like the one-number story or the serial. I should like to say as my last word for it here that I believe there are many novels which, if stripped of their padding, would turn out to have been all along merely novelettes in disguise.

It does not follow, however, that there are many novelle which, if they were duly padded, would be found novelettes. In that dim, subjective region, where the æsthetic origins present themselves almost with the authority of inspirations, there is nothing clearer than the difference between the short story motive and the long story motive. One, if one is in that line of work, feels instinctively just the size and carrying power of the given motive. Or, if the reader prefers a different figure, the mind which the seed has been dropped into from Somewhere is mystically aware whether the seed is going to grow up a bush or is going to grow up a tree, if left to itself. Of course, the mind to which the seed is entrusted may play it false, and willfully dwarf the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growth, or force it to unnatural dimensions; but the critical observer will easily detect the fact of this treason. Almost in the first germinal impulse the inventive mind forefeels the ultimate difference, and recognizes the essential simplicity or complexity of the motive. There will be a prophetic subdivision into a variety of motives and a multiplication of characters and incidents and situations; or the original motive will be divined indivisible, and there will be a small group of people immediately interested and controlled by a single, or predominant, fact. The uninspired may contend that this is bosh, and I own that something might be said for their contention, but upon the whole I think it is gospel.

The right novel is never a congeries of novelle, as might appear to the uninspired. If it indulges even in episodes it loses in reality and vitality. It is one stock from which its various branches put out, and form it a living growth identical throughout. The right novella is never a novel cropped back from the size of a tree to a bush, or the branch of a tree stuck into the ground and made to serve for a bush. It is another species, destined by the agencies at work in the realm of unconsciousness to be brought into being of its own kind, and not of another.

V.

This was always its case, but in the process of time the short story, while keeping the natural limits of the primal novella (if ever there was one), has shown almost limitless possibilities within them. It has shown itself capable of imparting the effect of every sort of intention, whether of humor or pathos, of tragedy, or comedy, or broad farce, or delicate irony, of character or action. The thing that first made itself known as a little tale, usually salacious, dealing with conventionalized types and conventionalized incidents, has proved itself possibly the most flexible of all the literary forms in its adaptation to the needs of the mind that wishes to utter itself, inventively or constructively, upon some fresh occasion, or wishes briefly to criticise or represent some phase or fact of life.

The riches in this shape of fiction are effectively inestimable, if we consider what has been done in the short story, and is still doing everywhere. The good novels may be easily counted, but the good novelle, since Boccaccio began (if it was he that first began) to make them, cannot be computed. In quantity they are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inexhaustible, and in quality they are wonderfully satisfying. Then, why is it that so very, very few of the most satisfactory of that innumerable multitude stays by you, as the country people say, in characterization or action? How hard it is to recall a person or a fact out of any of them, out of the most signally good! We seem to be delightfully nourished as we read, but is it, after all, a full meal? We become of a perfect intimacy and a devoted friendship with the men and women in the short stories, but not apparently of a lasting acquaintance. It is a single meeting we have with them, and though we instantly love or hate them dearly, recurrence and repetition seem necessary to that familiar knowledge in which we hold the personages in a novel.

It is here that the novella, so much more perfect in form, shows its irremediable inferiority to the novel, and somchow to the play, to the very farce, which it may quantitatively excel. We can all recall by name many characters out of comedies and farces; but how many characters out of short stories can we recall? Most persons of the drama give themselves away by name for types, mere figments of allegory, and perhaps oblivion is the penalty that the novella pays for the fineness of its characterizations; but perhaps, also, the dramatic form has greater facilities for repetition and so can stamp its persons more indelibly on the imagination than the narrative form in the same small space. The narrative must give to description what the drama trusts to representation; but this cannot account for the superior permanency of the dramatic types in so great measure as we might at first imagine, for they remain as much in mind from reading as from seeing the plays. It is possible that as the novella becomes more conscious, its persons will become more memorable; but as it is, though we now vividly and with lasting delight remember certain short stories, we scarcely remember by name any of the people in them. I may be risking too much in offering an instance, but who, in even such signal instances as "The Revolt of Mother," by Miss Wilkins, or "The Dulham Ladies," by Miss Jewett, can recall by name the characters that made them delightful?

VI.

The defect of the novella which we have been acknowledging seems an essential limitation; but perhaps it is not insuperable;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and we may yet have short stories which shall supply the delighted imagination with creations of as much immortality as we can reasonably demand. The structural change would not be greater than the moral or material change which has been wrought in it since it began as a yarn, gross and palpable, which the narrator spun out of the coarsest and often the filthiest stuff, to snare the thick fancy or amuse the lewd leisure of listeners willing as children to have the same persons and the same things over and over again. Now it has not only varied the persons and things, but it has refined and verified them in the direction of the natural and the supernatural, until it is above all other literary forms the vehicle of reality and spirituality. When one thinks of a bit of Mr. James' psychology in this form, or a bit of Verga's or Kielland's sociology, or a bit of Miss Jewett's exquisite veracity, one perceives the immense distance which the short story has come on the way to the height it has reached. It serves equally the ideal and the real; that which it is loth to serve is the unreal, so that among the short stories which have recently made reputations for their authors, very few are of that peculiar cast which we have no name for but romanticistic. The only distinguished modern writer of romanticistic novelle whom I can think of is Mr. Bret Harte, and he is of a period when romanticism was so imperative as to be almost a condition of fiction. I am never so enamored of a cause that I will not admit facts that seem to tell against it, and I will allow that this writer of romanticistic short stories has more than any other supplied us with memorable types and characters. We remember Mr. John Oakhurst by name; we remember "Kentuck" and "Tennessee's Partner," at least by nickname; and we remember their several qualities. These figures, if we cannot quite consent that they are persons, exist in our memories by force of their creator's imagination, and at the moment I cannot think of any others that do, out of the myriad of American short stories, except Rip Van Winkle out of Irving's "Legend of Sleepy Hollow," and Marjorie Daw out of Mr. Aldrich's famous little caprice of that title, and Mr. James' Daisy Miller.

It appears to be the fact that those writers who have first distinguished themselves in the novella have seldom written novels of prime order. Mr. Kipling is an eminent example, but Mr. Kipling has yet a long life before him in which to upset any theory

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about him, and one can only instance him provisionally. On the other hand, one can be much more confident that the best novelle have been written by the greatest novelists, conspicuously Maupassant, Verga, Björnsen, Mr. Thomas Hardy, Mr. James, Mr. Cable, Tourguénief, Tolstoy, Valdés, not to name others. These have, in fact, all done work so good in this form that one is tempted to call it their best work. It is really not their best, but it is work so good that it ought to have equal acceptance with their novels, if that distinguished editor was right who said that short stories sold well when they were good short stories. That they ought to do so is so evident that a devoted reader of them to whom I was submitting the anomaly the other day, insisted that they did. I could only allege the testimony of publishers and authors to the contrary, and this did not satisfy him.

It does not satisfy me, and I wish that the general reader with whom the fault lies, could be made to say why, if he likes one short story by itself and four short stories in a magazine, he does not like, or will not have, a dozen short stories in a book. This was the baffling question which I began with, and which I find myself forced to end with, after all the light I have thrown upon the subject. I leave it where I found it, but perhaps that is a good deal for a critic to do. If I had left it anywhere else the reader might not feel bound to deal with it practically by reading all the books of short stories he could lay hands on, and either divining why he did not enjoy them, or else forever foregoing his prejudice against them because of his pleasure in them.

W. D. Howells.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED